

cating a purpose upon the part of the Senate to adopt the concurrent resolution, modified or unmodified.

COUNT OF THE ELECTORAL VOTE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, to which he invites the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN].

The Chief Clerk read House Concurrent Resolution No. 44, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 8th day of February, 1933, at 1 o'clock p. m., pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed as they are opened by the President of the Senate all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, this concurrent resolution is in the usual form adopted on previous occasions to canvass and declare the result of the last national election. It seems unnecessary to have it considered by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I therefore move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think there is no objection to that course.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

TREATY WITH ALBANIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Chair lays before the Senate, as in executive session, a treaty transmitted by the President of the United States, which will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in confidence for the use of the Senate.

WITHHOLDING OF ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS PAY

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate recall from the House of Representatives Senate bill 4810, a bill which was passed yesterday, and concerning which I entered a motion to reconsider.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I ask what is the bill?

Mr. KING. It is a bill that came from the War Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a bill to authorize the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to withhold the pay of officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps to cover indebtedness to the United States under certain conditions, passed yesterday. The Senator from Utah has entered a motion to reconsider; but in order to reconsider, the papers will have to be recalled from the House of Representatives. That motion the Chair understands the Senator from Utah to be now making.

Mr. REED. Do I understand that if the motion is carried, the Senator will insist to-day on action on his motion to reconsider?

Mr. KING. Oh, no, Mr. President!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that that action can not be had until the papers are physically in the possession of the Senate.

Mr. KING. I shall not delay the Senate to-night with the consideration of the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah that the House be requested to return the papers.

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, January 5, 1933, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Heavenly Father, that through Christ we have an eternal inheritance in God. May our powers be consecrated, our lives made exultant, and our influence crowned by the teaching of His holy word. Bless all of us with that temper, with that glorious courage, and with that unrelenting energy that spring from His earthly life. Ours is a high trust; oh, may we be loyal to it and leave a work that shall sustain the undecaying life in the very soul of the Nation. May we strive with every nerve to exalt, refresh, and reinforce our native land until our national sky shall glow through all its arch with the radiance of the upspringing light. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on House Joint Resolution 123, relating to moratorium on foreign debts.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Herman H. Bradford; and

H. R. 13607. An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4082. An act to regulate the business of executing bonds for compensation in criminal cases and to improve the administration of justice in the District of Columbia;

S. 4810. An act to authorize the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to withhold the pay of officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps to cover indebtedness to the United States under certain conditions;

S. 5131. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.;

S. 5231. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

S. 5232. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Charles, Mo.; and

S. 5235. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Brownsville, Nebr.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 339) for printing under the rule:

House Resolution 339

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 13991, a bill to aid agriculture and relieve existing national economic emergency. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed eight hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of several of my colleagues, that the resolution may be read for the information of the Members.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina when he intends to bring up this rule?

Mr. POUL. I believe on to-morrow. I would like to be informed by the Speaker whether that is in accord with the present business of the House.

The SPEAKER. It is hoped to bring up this rule to-morrow, if we can finish the deficiency appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. SNELL. I hope the gentleman will be able to tell us what is in the bill.

Mr. POUL. I refer the gentleman to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the interest rate in New York and Chicago on call money, interest to brokers, cotton brokers, wheat brokers, and corn brokers is 1 per cent per annum. Interest to farm owners and home owners is 6, 8, and 10 per cent.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman tell us where we can get some of this cheap money?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman were a broker and wanted to gamble on the stock exchange, he could get all he wanted.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13975) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the first deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 13975), with Mr. O'CONNOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

All of yesterday was consumed, Mr. Chairman, in debate upon subjects which are not covered in this bill. There was no statement made for the RECORD as to just what this bill carries, and I have asked the indulgence of the committee for two or three minutes while I state for the RECORD just what the committee has recommended to the House for inclusion in the bill.

The amount recommended to be appropriated in this bill is \$31,421,520.57, which sum is \$12,285,188.42 less than the

Budget estimates. It should be stated that of this sum of \$31,421,000, \$28,000,000 represents an appropriation which is made available for the payment of tax refunds between now and July 1, which will come up for consideration in a few moments, and the greater part of this reduction—practically all of it, in fact—occurs in the reduction which the committee has made in the estimate submitted for tax refunds, which originally was \$40,000,000 and which the committee has reduced \$12,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS. I will.

Mr. SNELL. Have these tax refunds turned out to be greater or less than the general experience for the last few years? As I understand it, the gentleman said the committee had reduced the amount for tax refunds because the committee did not believe they would come up to what was estimated. What has been the experience of the Government in the last few years in regard to tax refunds? Has it been more or less than estimated?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, they have always been less. But the gentleman will recall that last year there was no appropriation made and there was no estimate submitted, and Mr. Mills stated then, and I stated to the House at the time the bill was reported, quoting from Mr. Mills and also on behalf of the committee, that there would undoubtedly be an appropriation required in December or at the December session to take care of tax refunds.

Mr. SNELL. But that was one of the things that was left out entirely last year?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. So when it was put out to the country that our appropriations were so much less or so much saved, it really did not mean that exactly.

Mr. BYRNS. Well, I think that was made very plain by Mr. Mills, the Secretary of the Treasury, when he appeared before our committee, because he was frank enough to say that he had not included in his estimates any sum for tax refunds, and he was frank enough to say at the time that he felt probably \$40,000,000 would have to be appropriated at the December session in order to take care of it; but that they had enough money to run until December and, owing to the condition of the Treasury and the size of the deficit, he felt that in the matter of tax refunds that money could well be left off. We followed his suggestion and recommendation when we did not include it.

Mr. SNELL. I thought I understood the gentleman to say there was \$28,000,000 put in.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, those are regular obligations of the Government from year to year which have to be met?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; undoubtedly.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does this deficiency bill take care of items of deficiency to the extent of \$600,000 in the deportation of aliens?

Mr. BYRNS. No; it does not.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This bill also eliminates any deficiency for the additional 30 days' furlough that is to be given or has now been given to the men in the Immigration Service, does it not?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; it eliminates that.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Does it eliminate it?

Mr. BYRNS. It eliminates any necessity for that by making available a transfer from other funds for the purpose of taking care of these employees to the extent of \$20,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee be given five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It only provides \$20,000 for the District of Columbia. It does not take care of the more than 3,000

men in the Immigration Service and border patrol who, in addition to the Government furlough, have been penalized with another furlough by the administration because of lack of funds, and that amounts to a total of about \$600,000.

I wish to know from the chairman whether the deficiency bill provides the means for restoring to these men the 30-day administrative furlough.

Mr. BYRNS. It does not. The Budget estimates did not include it. The committee, therefore, did not see the necessity of going into it. We did not make any appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question along that same line?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Why were the immigration and border-patrol services further penalized beyond the average Government employee in any other department?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not think they have been penalized to any further extent.

Mr. SNELL. All of them must take an extra furlough of 30 days and some of six months.

Mr. BYRNS. I have just been advised that the Secretary of Labor has modified that order. I did not notice it myself. It will be modified so that everybody will have the same administrative furlough.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It will only tend to make matters worse.

Mr. SNELL. I would like to have it made clear as to whether it is to be modified to make the furlough apply to all the members of that service or whether it applies to only those latest to enter the service.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman from New York, who has been talking economy, that if he wants to make the appropriations necessary to pay for those employees that his own administration says are not necessary, an amendment upon this bill is in order, and if the House wants to adopt it it may; but we have not seen fit to add \$600,000 to the expenses of the Government, when the President and the Budget did not ask for it. [Applause.] That is the whole story.

Mr. SNELL. I am just trying to get information from the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS. And I am trying to give it to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. There is no need to get excited over it.

Mr. BYRNS. I am not getting excited over it.

Mr. SNELL. I wish to ask the gentleman another question: How are the men in the Immigration Service and border patrol going to get any advantage from the present amount that is carried?

Mr. BYRNS. I just can not tell the gentleman. That is a matter of administration. We have taken care of those in the District whom the Secretary said were necessary, to the extent of \$20,000, by making certain funds available.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I can explain this situation?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The Secretary of Labor, as a result of a condition along the border, had to do a great deal of extra work there. The Chinese were being expelled from Mexico and thrown over to our line. The moment they threw them over the department picked them up. They were all smuggled. As a result of this crusade 2,500 Chinese were picked up. This vigilance and extra work created a deficiency in the appropriation.

Now, in order to meet the Budget, the Secretary issued an order cutting 10 per cent of the service for six months. They appealed to the Secretary of Labor, because most of these men, even the youngest, have been in the service 10 years, and most of them are veterans of the World War, all of them have large families, and they could not take a lay-off of six months. The older men in the service, in order to help out the younger men, all agreed temporarily to take an additional 30 days. So, instead of a 6 months' furlough, they all took a 30 days' furlough.

I propose to offer an amendment at the proper time to restore to this service the \$600,000 deficit for wages and

salaries so that they may not be penalized more than any other department of the Government.

Mr. SNELL. What I was trying to bring out was why the Immigration Service should be penalized and its men laid off in greater proportion than those in any other service.

Mr. BYRNS. That is exactly what I am trying to find out myself.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is it not a fact that under the present order immigration has practically stopped? If this be so, why is the same number of employees needed now that were needed a few years ago when thousands were coming in monthly? What have they to do?

Mr. BYRNS. Owing to the fact that immigration has fallen off and we are having very little of it now as compared with what we had years ago, it was not necessary to make an appropriation to take care of a lot of employees who will not be needed.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. By reason of the added restrictions on immigration we have increased smuggling of aliens, and unless these aliens are picked up in time and sent back at the expense of the transportation companies which brought them here, they will be picked up later on and sent back at the expense of the Government. I served in the Immigration Service some 25 years ago and have had some experience. I know this is not economy, because the smuggling will increase, we will have more trouble on our hands, and it is more costly to send the aliens back if they are found to be in the United States unlawfully than to catch them at the time of entry and deport them immediately.

Mr. BYRNS. That is the very honest opinion of my good friend from New York and I am not underrating it, but I will say that the committee in failing to make this appropriation acted in accordance with the judgment of the sworn officers of the law consisting of the Secretary of Labor, the Commissioner of Immigration, the President of the United States, and the Bureau of the Budget. When they were not asking for this additional and immense sum which has been suggested we did not feel that the committee ought to undertake to add to the appropriation and thereby add to the deficit in the Treasury.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I may say that I have conferred with the same officials and they say this is going to impair their service and they are asking for additional funds.

Mr. BYRNS. These other gentlemen whose duty it is to maintain our immigration laws do not think so. This is a difference of opinion between the gentleman from New York and the administrative officers, and I can not settle that.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I have been told that the reason the appropriation was running low was because so much of the money for this department was used in deporting aliens and this made them shy of money to pay for the salaries of employees. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not know whether that is correct or not. I know they have been using all the money available for the purpose of deporting aliens.

Mr. SNELL. They have gone a great deal beyond the amount available for that particular service and they have taken it out of the money for salaries.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not believe I am misquoting him—we have a very excellent Immigration Commissioner in the person of Hon. Harry Hull, who, I think, has made a splendid official. I know he is highly conscientious and I know he

is very much interested in deporting these aliens when they are apprehended and held in jail.

Mr. SNELL. I am entirely in favor of that.

Mr. BYRNS. Because they are an expense on the States and the cities or the localities where they are being held, and they ought to be sent back.

Mr. SNELL. Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that to stop them at the border, by trained, well-paid officials, is better than to have them get into this country and then have to deport them?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; but I will say to my friend that you have had millions of dollars appropriated for this purpose and they are here. Having come in under these circumstances, with liberal appropriations made in the past, I want to know how you are going to prevent additional entries into this country by appropriating \$600,000.

Mr. SNELL. We are certainly not going to prevent it by cutting down the force on the borders, because there is more incentive to these people to get in here now that we have limited immigration than there was before.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman's inquiry shows you have not prevented it in the past and the gentleman will not deny that we have had most liberal appropriations.

Mr. SNELL. I admit we have not entirely prevented it, but we have more of it at the present time, as shown by the extra large number of deportations.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not think so, because I think if the gentleman will look at the record with respect to those who are being deported, he will find that the great majority of them have been in this country for years.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. They have been in jail for years.

Mr. BYRNS. Some of them have been in jail for months and years and they are merely being picked up now, having slipped into this country in one way or another in the past. These men are not recent entries.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may have five additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. I would like for some of these other gentlemen to get time of their own and let me conclude.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question to see if we can clear up this situation?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. DYER. The statement has been made by the gentleman from New York that there have been large deportations. I would like to know what the number has been, how many have been deported, and whether or not the money has been used for that purpose. It is easy, Mr. Chairman, to make a statement and say that the money is to be used in deporting aliens, but the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations states that the department officials have not appeared before him and have not given him any information on the need of this additional money. I think it would be most unwise to follow the suggestion of gentlemen who make bare statements without giving any facts, unless the Committee on Appropriations has facts to justify such an expenditure.

Mr. BYRNS. I agree with the gentleman, and the gentleman has stated the matter much more clearly than I could. That is exactly what I was trying to put across.

I may say to my friend that we had one estimate, and that estimate asked the Congress to authorize the transfer of \$20,000 from one fund where the money was available in order to take care of certain employees here in the District of Columbia who are needed in this deportation work. We allowed this estimate. There was no estimate before us for \$600,000 or any other amount, and, therefore, we did not go into the question of whether or not additional sums are needed, because it has never been the practice of the Appropriations Committee, in its consideration of appropriation measures, to go out and try to find something for which to make appropriations.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. BYRNS. We are trying to avoid them, as you know. So we did not go into that. I was not expecting this question of immigration to come up, certainly not at this time. I have sent for some information, and when this matter is reached in the regular order during the consideration of the bill, when it is being taken up under the 5-minute rule, I hope to have more information.

Mr. SNELL. All right; that will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The minority leader is criticizing a situation that is solely the result of action of his own administration.

Mr. SNELL. I did not say anything about who was responsible for it. I wanted to get the information.

Mr. BLANTON. But the situation the gentleman is criticizing is the result of action of his own administration. The gentleman has entrée to the White House daily, hourly, and every minute. Why does not the gentleman go down there and complain? Why does the gentleman come on the floor of the House when it is to his administration that he ought to make this complaint?

Mr. SNELL. I want to say to the gentleman that I am inquiring of the chief source of information, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; I have a right to do so and I shall continue to do so.

Mr. BYRNS. I have no objection to answering the question.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from Tennessee has said that he has not the information now but he will furnish it later on, and that is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I have the hearings, in which Mr. Wagner says that for the year, including the removal of indigent aliens, the deportations were 22,063. He says that they plan a 25,000 deportation program for this year if the funds are made available.

Mr. SNELL. That does not answer the question that I propounded, whether more money was spent in the last year for deportation than was allowed in the original appropriation bill. I understand that there was more used, and for that reason they were obliged to cut down the personnel.

Mr. BYRNS. They did not use more than was allowed in the bill. I have the hearings now before me. Mr. Wagner stated:

The necessity for the change in limitation is to enable the bureau to function efficiently and economically. The amount available last year for personal services in the District of Columbia was \$385,530. This year it is \$300,000, which is a reduction of over 22 per cent, although the reduction in the general appropriation was only 10 per cent.

He further says:

Our deportation work in the field has been increased, not decreased. Our other activities have been maintained at the same rate as they were maintained last year. During the last half of the fiscal year our reentry-permit work will be at its peak.

Furthermore, the work will pile up in the bureau, and that will result in delay in disposing of warrant cases in the field, and what you save in Washington will speedily be overcome by increased detention and maintenance expenses in the field.

He further says:

I have not the figures here for the five months of last year, but the total for the year, including the removal of indigent aliens, was 22,063. We plan a 25,000-deportation program this year if the funds are made available, and we are going at that rate right now.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can furnish the information. The number of aliens deported is not necessarily any guide to the amount of money required. There are two classes of deportations. We have a class of aliens deported for causes existing prior, and if confronted within a certain time they are deported at the expense of the steamship company that brought them in.

On the other hand, there is a second class of criminal aliens, deported at the expense of the Government. So, unless you know how many aliens were deported at the expense of the Government, which was not estimated when the orig-

inal appropriation was made, you do not know how much money was spent on either class.

Mr. BYRNS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a minute of my own time. The immigration matter will come up under the 5-minute rule and be threshed out at that time. I did not anticipate that it would arise now. I got up to put some figures in the RECORD and to call the attention of the House to this fact in justice to myself. A year ago my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] took me to task repeatedly with the charge that I was recommending, on behalf of the committee, appropriations which I knew, and they knew, would not be sufficient to carry us through the fiscal year. I told the gentleman from Nebraska that the Committee on Appropriations had adequate hearings and that these appropriations had been made so that in my judgment and the judgment of the committee the departments would be able to function with efficiency.

I simply call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that despite the statement of my friend from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] I was entirely correct in my repeated statements, and that the deficiencies which have been submitted to this committee and which we are carrying in this bill, exclusive of the tax refunds which everyone understood, amount to only \$285,000, the lowest ever carried in any urgent deficiency appropriation bill, so far as I know, in the most recent history of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. At what time in the bill does the gentleman mean to bring this up, if there is no item carrying it?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, there is an item relating to immigration.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. So far three of the major appropriation bills have passed the House. Under the able and intelligent leadership of our chairman [Mr. BYRNS] they are \$425,000,000 below the appropriations for the same activities for 1933 and \$56,000,000 below the Budget estimates for 1934, a very creditable showing.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is beginning hearings to-day upon the independent offices appropriation bill, which provides the annual appropriations for forty-odd Government departments.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman explain to us how much of the original \$56,000,000 is actual saving and how much is merely bookkeeping, which will have to be paid later by the Federal Government on account of contracts in existence at the present time?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not a dollar, so far as I know.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman makes that statement—"Not a dollar." What about the road contracts and public-buildings contracts?

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, that is not in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. SNELL. I am talking about the \$56,000,000 to which the gentleman just referred.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not know. I can not answer the gentleman as to that. The independent offices appropriation bill for the current year carried \$982,446,041, which was \$56,000,000 below the Budget estimates; and, so far as I know, not one dollar of that \$56,000,000 will ever have to be appropriated or paid out of the Public Treasury. The Budget estimates for the independent offices appropriation bill for 1934 are \$1,027,786,501, or approximately 25 per cent of the entire Federal Budget. Taking out certain nonrecurring items, the Budget estimates are nearly \$45,000,000 more for 1934 than for the current fiscal year. Of that sum, \$990,860,834 is for the Veterans' Administration, leaving something less than \$40,000,000 for the other 39 independent Government establishments, so that if the Subcommittee on Appropriations would do what, of course, it can not do, abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Radio Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and all

of the other 39 independent establishments, our bill would still be about \$10,000,000 more than it is for the current fiscal year, if we did not touch the Veterans' Administration. I do not want to inject into the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill any controversy, but I have some proposals I expect to make to the subcommittee with reference to temporary reductions in the Veterans' Administration appropriation which, if followed by the committee and the House, will reduce it \$85,000,000 for the next fiscal year; and, in order not to get into any controversy or any argument which would impede the consideration of this bill, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point by inserting some observations on that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, in the present economic crisis the paramount duty of Congress—a duty which overshadows everything else—is to balance the Federal Budget. The keystone in the arch of economic stability is a balanced Budget. The Democratic Party is definitely committed to the proposition of bringing the Federal expenditures within the limits of the receipts of the Government. Despite the economies of the last session of Congress and notwithstanding the revenue bill, which sought to supply sufficient revenue to balance the Budget, we are daily spending for the cost of the Federal Government millions of dollars more than our receipts. This condition can not continue without grave danger to the safety of the Republic. It is useless to talk of recovery and expansion in business so long as the finances of the Federal Government are in such a chaotic condition. Nothing that the present Congress can do will mean so much to hasten economic recovery as to show the American people that it will, without regard to political expediency, reduce the cost of government to a point where, with a reasonable revision of the revenue laws, Uncle Sam will again be on a self-supporting basis. The first step in balancing the Budget is to cut expenses. The last resort should be additional taxes.

So far four appropriation bills have been reported to Congress. Three have passed the lower House, and under the able leadership of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, these four bills are, in round figures, \$425,000,000 below the appropriations for the same activities for the current (1933) fiscal year, and, in round figures, \$56,000,000 below the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget, which were approved by the President for the next (1934) fiscal year. This is a creditable showing.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has begun hearings on this bill, covering, as it does, some forty-odd Government departments, bureaus, and commissions and including the Veterans' Administration. This bill as passed by the House of Representatives in the last session of Congress was in the sum of \$932,446,041. As finally passed, it was approximately \$56,000,000 below Budget estimates. Added to that were certain nonrecurring items, as follows:

Appropriation for the world's fair at Chicago.....	\$1,000,000
Advance loan to bonus marchers.....	100,000
Amount appropriated to reimburse Federal Farm Board for wheat and cotton donated to the emergency-relief committees.....	40,000,000
Initial appropriation for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	250,000
Amount transferred from the radio division of the Department of Commerce to the Federal Radio Commission.....	490,000
Total.....	41,840,000

Or a total gross amount for the independent establishments of the Government for the current fiscal year of \$1,024,286,041. The estimates submitted to our committee for the fiscal year 1934 for independent offices of the Government are \$1,027,786,501, or a net increase of \$3,500,460 over the 1933 appropriations. Deducting from the estimates for 1934 the nonrecurring items above set forth which figured in the total appropriations for 1933, we have a net

increase in the budgetary estimates for 1934 for independent offices of \$44,975,460. The major items constituting these increases are as follows:

Veterans' Administration (approximately)-----	\$41,000,000
U. S. Shipping Board for the operating deficiency for the Emergency Fleet Corporation (approximately)---	3,000,000
Supreme Court Building (approximately)-----	2,000,000

The subcommittee will, following its custom, make minute examination of every expenditure provided for in this bill and make every possible reduction consistent with orderly and efficient operation of governmental functions.

In the 1933 bill there was carried for the Veterans' Administration the sum of \$948,799,000. Of this amount \$20,850,000 was the Government's contribution to the employees' retirement fund, and in no sense of the word a disbursement for veterans. The estimates for Veterans' Administration now before the committee for 1934 are \$990,860,834, or an increase, approximately, of \$48,000,000. Of this \$48,000,000 about \$1,500,000 is occasioned by salaries and expenses incident to the bringing in of additional hospital and domiciliary facilities. The remainder represents the net increase in compensation, disability allowances, and pensions occasioned by the filing of new claims.

It will be seen at once that if any substantial saving is to be made in the appropriations for the independent offices of the Government as represented in this bill, which carries more than 20 per cent of the entire Federal Budget, that some reduction will have to be made in the amount of the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration.

In the last session of Congress a joint committee was constituted composed of Members of the House and the Senate and charged with the duty of making a comprehensive survey of veterans' expenditures with a view to correcting inequalities and recommending to Congress legislation that ultimately will bring about a reduction in these expenditures with the least possible effect on deserving veterans and their dependents. This committee is conducting hearings upon this subject and has been authorized by the House to file its report not later than March 3, 1933. This committee is not empowered to report legislation, but is merely a fact-finding body. This report, when filed, will no doubt be referred to the Veterans' Committee of the House for its consideration. Therefore, there is no reason to suppose there will be any change made in the fundamental law relative to veterans' compensation in time to affect the 1934 appropriations.

What I am about to say upon this subject is my own individual opinion and in no way reflects the sentiments of other members of my subcommittee who, of course, will ultimately have the responsibility of passing upon the matter. In my judgment, Congress can not justify its position, or retain its objective to balance the Federal Budget, without making some temporary reduction in the cost of the Veterans' Administration. I believe I reflect the sentiment of the American people when I say that the best is none too good for the veteran who is disabled because of his services in the World War, and that the widows, orphans, and dependent parents of veterans who died from service-connected disabilities should be generously treated by the Government. This is being done and will undoubtedly continue to be the policy of the Government. America has been generous to her veterans, but the time has come, in my judgment, when, due to the critical condition of our finances, every person who draws compensation or payment in any form whatever out of the Federal Treasury should make his reasonable contribution to the balancing of our Budget and thus hasten the return of the day when our national finances will be on a stable basis and the solvency of our Government beyond question.

I have spoken of our duty as Americans to the veteran disabled because of his war service. Let us not forget our duty to the able-bodied veteran, many of whom, because of inability to secure employment, are in destitute circumstances—even far worse than their comrades who because of disabilities are drawing compensation from the Government. Our duty to the able-bodied and to every citizen is to

bring about a condition in our country, if we can, where every man will have an opportunity to support himself and his dependents by honest toil. The first step toward this goal is to set our financial house in order.

It is not the function of the Appropriations Committee to make changes in the fundamental or organic laws, and I would not favor such a course by our committee, and I believe the interested parties are entitled to have their day in court, and that before any drastic change is made in the fundamental law relative to veterans, we should have the benefit of the report of our special committee, and that the proposed changes should be considered by the legislative committee of the House of Representatives in regular order. In the emergency, however, as I have stated, there must be some temporary reductions made; and upon my own individual responsibility I propose to submit to my subcommittee when they come to consider this question certain temporary reductions to apply only to the next fiscal year, which I do not believe will work a hardship upon any veteran, but which will enable us to reduce the cost of the Veterans' Administration in the next fiscal year approximately \$85,000,000. My proposal will be as follows:

First. A straight 10 per cent temporary reduction in all forms of World War compensation. This includes compensation being paid in service-connected cases, disability allowances, and compensation paid to dependents of veterans who have died of service-connected disabilities.

Second. A straight 10 per cent temporary reduction in Army and Navy pensions, which includes Spanish-American, Civil War, and all other pensions.

Third. Under the terms of the economy act the emergency retired officers were given an 8½ per cent reduction in their pay, and to this I would add 1½ per cent reduction, bringing them up to the 10 per cent reduction.

The reductions enumerated in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 will bring a net saving of \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year.

Fourth. The appropriation for disability allowances for 1933 was, in round figures, \$103,000,000. The estimate for 1934 contemplates 100,000 new claims and an appropriation of approximately \$125,000,000. Due to a marked falling off in the number of new claims being filed, it will be possible to reduce this estimate in the sum of \$20,000,000.

Fifth. Under the present law veterans without dependents and suffering from service-connected disabilities, when hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration for such disabilities, are given an increased compensation on the basis of a temporary total rating. The practical effect of this is that a veteran receiving \$15 per month is placed in the hospital for treatment and his compensation is increased to \$90 per month, and so forth. I am speaking now only of veterans without dependents.

I propose that we shall provide for the next fiscal year that when a veteran without dependents is hospitalized for a service-connected disability, the maximum compensation shall be \$20 per month. I reiterate that this will in no way affect veterans with dependents who are hospitalized for service-connected disabilities. This temporary change in the law would mean a saving of approximately \$5,000,000 for the next year, making a total possible reduction of \$85,000,000, only \$65,000,000 of which will be the withdrawal of benefits now being received. I believe the rank and file of the veterans will raise no serious objection to the proposals I have made. I believe most of the veterans and their leaders realize that in these tragic times there is a duty upon every citizen, and especially upon every person receiving funds out of the Federal Treasury to do his bit. Compared to some of the drastic proposals that are being pressed relative to veterans my suggestions are reasonable and conservative.

I shall also suggest to my subcommittee that the same rule be applied to those persons who are drawing compensation or payments through the Federal Employees' Compensation Commission on account of disabilities incurred in the civil employment of the Government. This will bring a reduction in this appropriation of approximately \$400,000. Other savings of consequence will be found.

It is never a pleasant task to reduce the income of a fellow citizen, especially in these strenuous times, but we must remember that the employees of the Government have taken a reduction in their wages for one year, and will take it again this year, and we should bear in mind the fact that while the economy act provided for an 8½ per cent reduction in wages through the legislative furlough, many of the Government departments, in order to operate within their reduced appropriations, have been forced to give administrative furloughs, which have greatly increased the financial contribution that is being made by the Government employees.

Every State, city, and county government is being compelled to cut drastically its program in nearly every governmental function and in many instances its relief program as well.

The country has expressed confidence in the leadership of Governor Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. It looks forward to March 4 as a great day when a new order of things will come about and when the ever-darkening skies will begin to brighten. The mere advent of a Democratic administration and the inauguration of Governor Roosevelt will not contain within itself the magic necessary to bring about this sudden reversal of affairs. It is going to take aggressive action on the part of the legislative and executive branches of the Government in striking boldly at the causes of the trouble, one of which I reiterate is an unbalanced Federal Budget.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes on the discussion of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. We have not yet reached the item in the bill that the gentleman evidently is going to discuss. I think we ought to read the bill down to that item, and when we come to it, discuss it. For the moment I object to a further extension of five minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if my good friend understood this question, he would allow me more than 10 minutes, as I think it is of vital importance to almost 3,609 families.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting to the gentleman having some additional time, but I think the gentleman ought to wait until the item is reached in the bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think this is an important matter before the Congress and that we ought to have some figures presented in respect to it.

Mr. HASTINGS. I shall take the responsibility of objecting to any extension of time at the present time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not quarreling with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I think he has a hard job and has rendered some very valuable and able service and has saved the country millions and millions of dollars, but this is no time to save when you are dealing with the foundation of the Government, and that is your immigration and your border patrol. Once you remove and destroy the personnel of the border patrol which protects your borders, once you destroy your immigration inspectors that have charge of the incoming and outgoing of people, you destroy the fundamental principles of this Government, and this place will not be safe for Americans to live in.

Now, what does this do? An unusual situation arose. During the last fiscal year a number of Chinese have been deported from Mexico, and they found their way into El Paso and other border points of the United States. What could the officials do? They must either pick them up or give them a medal for smuggling from Mexico into the United States. So they picked up 2,256 Chinese, whom they were compelled to deport at an additional cost of \$288,650. It was either deport those Chinese or let them come in to your community and my community. They had no business here. Mexico did not want them. We did not want them, but we were the sufferers because we had our border patrol.

Our immigration inspectors were alert enough to pick them up and send them back. Now, because of this deficiency and because of this expenditure, they now want to reduce the personnel of the immigration and border patrol by turning them off. In other words, they want to take it out of the Immigration Service, out of the personnel.

A month ago the Secretary of Labor—who in my opinion has rendered some valuable service and who is an able and honest man—issued an order laying off 10 per cent of the entire service, which includes, as I said a moment ago, 10 per cent of 3,669 men. So I appeal to you that it would be a discrimination against a group of 10 per cent to lay them off—in other words, to discharge them for six months. The Secretary of Labor, after due consideration, had fixed a 30-day furlough for the whole service, amounting to 3,669.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I understood the gentleman to say that the Secretary of Labor laid off 10 per cent of something over 3,000 men?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. He laid off 10 per cent of the Immigration Service.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Did he not rather lay off a certain number of men for 10 per cent of the time?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The original order was a 6-month furlough to 10 per cent of the personnel outside of the District of Columbia, because some of the money that was to be used for their pay was used in the deportation of these Chinese who came from Mexico into our country.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I simply wanted to get the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will let us read this bill. We will come to the question of immigration on page 7 and it will come up in order at the proper place. We want to get through with this bill to-day and take up the agricultural relief bill to-morrow.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Revision of the Laws: For the employment of competent persons to assist in continuing the work of compiling, codifying, and revising the laws and treaties of the United States, fiscal years 1933 and 1934, \$3,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: On page 2, line 18, strike out the words "continuing the work."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the President of the United States sent to Congress a recommendation to appropriate an additional \$150,000 for continuing the work of the so-called arms conference at Geneva.

It will be remembered that last year the President sent a recommendation to Congress to appropriate \$450,000 for this so-called arms conference. I took the position at that time on this floor that it would be an absolute waste of money, that no good would be accomplished by it, and that we ought not to appropriate the \$450,000. I then predicted that instead of accomplishing good it would do harm, as our presence there at this time would incite bad feeling in different parts of Europe against our country. Just that very thing has happened. Congress, in its wisdom, instead of allowing \$450,000 as asked by the President, saw fit to allow only \$300,000, and that sum was appropriated; both the House and the Senate, on the floor and in the hearings and in the conference, indicated to the administration that that was all that could be spent, \$300,000 which Congress appropriated; that they must not go beyond that limit of \$300,000; and this crowd has been junketing in Europe for months.

I will show you why they are now coming here and asking for another \$150,000. In addition to the high-salaried employees of the Government who were connected with that so-called arms conference, they have one press-relations man drawing \$5,000 salary and expenses connected with it. They have one advisor drawing \$8,000 salary and expenses; they have one assistant clerk drawing \$3,000 and expenses; they

have one corresponding clerk drawing \$2,400 and expenses; and they have 15 clerks and stenographers drawing each \$200 a month and expenses.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is not the chairman of that committee a Democrat?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not care whether he is a Democrat or a Republican or a mixture of both, or a Hottentot. This expense ought to stop, and we ought not allow a single red sou of ours to be wasted over there any further. What good has been accomplished by it? Not a single thing.

In addition to that recommendation, I want the Members to note that on yesterday the President of the United States also sent an additional recommendation here asking that we should appropriate an additional \$150,000 for the so-called European economic conference. There then will be a continuation of this extensive propaganda for cancellation of foreign debts. We would be involved in that project. We ought to sit down on that so hard that they will never raise that question again in this country. And we ought not to appropriate these two \$150,000 items for the President.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Potsdam—

Mr. SNELL. Well, it is not necessary to add any flourishes.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the minority leader with and without flourishes.

Mr. SNELL. That will be perfectly all right.

Mr. BLANTON. Because lately, within the last few short weeks, the gentleman is becoming very active on this floor.

Mr. SNELL. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. Without any further flourishes?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. Is the gentleman in favor of that \$450,000 waste?

Mr. SNELL. Has the conference spent any more money than was appropriated up to the present time?

Mr. BLANTON. No. And they must not spend more. And we ought to notify them to come home. They had an arrangement among themselves that they would travel on the big, fine boats, having the finest quarters, if you please, with a full retinue of servants to wait on them. Our committee, headed by its distinguished chairman, sat down on that proposition, and we made them travel on regular liners, which they ought to do in this time of depression.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the statesman from Milwaukee.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman again repudiates the solemn platform pledge of the Democrats to take part in such a conference.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not repudiating anything in any sense. I want to stop this eternal, wasteful spending.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman has repudiated every one of them.

Mr. BLANTON. I have not repudiated, and I have not been repudiated by my constituents.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I understood from the vitriolic statement of the gentleman from Texas that he was protesting against recommendation made by the President of the United States in his message of yesterday that \$150,000 be authorized for participation in a conference on international monetary and economic conditions.

In the last Congress, according to the letter of the Secretary of State, we appropriated \$40,000 for participation in an international monetary conference. No conference so far has been called. Since that appropriation was authorized both the leading political parties confirmed in their platforms the policy of holding an international conference on economic and monetary matters. The gentleman

himself voted in this House in the last session in favor of such a proposal.

Mr. BLANTON. When; where?

Mr. STAFFORD. On the tariff bill that provides for the holding of a conference with foreign nations.

Mr. BLANTON. No; the gentleman will not find me voting for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman has been voting so many times and so irascibly that he does not know how he voted.

Mr. BLANTON. The RECORD will show I did not vote for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The RECORD will show the gentleman voted in favor of the proposal. The President of the United States is seeking to accomplish some order out of confusion by the creation of a great international conference to deal with economic and monetary matters. Everybody who has the slightest information as to these subjects knows it is necessary to have a conference to bring order out of industrial chaos existing everywhere. How better can it be done than by having conferences of the leading nations to discuss this all-important question of monetary and economic conditions affecting the respective nations? I hope the gentleman will wake up sometime to the need of the necessary appropriations for real world revival of industry. This recommendation, I will say to the gentleman, has nothing to do with the Geneva armament conference, nothing at all, as the gentleman stated in his remarks.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I am one of those who regrets exceedingly that the distinguished gentleman is not going to be with us next session. I think he is one of the most valuable men in the House—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. BLANTON. But I would rather some one who is going to serve with me in the coming Congress would make the criticism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment was a pro forma amendment. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes has been used in discussion of the amendment. All time has expired on the amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is pending offered by the gentleman from Texas. The question occurs on that amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic leader, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, a few minutes ago again repudiated solemn declarations contained in the Democratic platform. I wish to reiterate that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, as my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin has indicated, that the gentleman from Texas rose in his place and voted for the Democratic tariff bill in the last session of Congress, which provided for an international conference along the lines of the well-known Democratic conference policy with representatives of foreign governments which allows the American country and the American people to be crucified.

We find in the 1932 platform of the Democratic Party, which again denounces the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill and tariff protection, that the Democrats are pledged to consider tariff questions in conference with the representatives of foreign nations. Taking into consideration the buck passing to America at those Democratic conferences with foreign nations, such as were entered into under and resulted from the treaty of Versailles and the international policy of the last Democratic administration, I can imagine that we will come out on the short end of the deal if that policy is to continue under the new Democratic administration.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. The gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The last word of the amendment is "work."

Mr. BLANTON. I hope my friend will let him proceed.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not qualified to speak on the last word.

Mr. SCHAFER. I am discussing the last word, "work," to wit, the work of the Democratic leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], in repudiating the 1932 Democratic platform.

Mr. Chairman, when we study the foreign policy of the last Democratic administration and its meddling and conferences with foreign governments, which have repudiated their honest obligations and are causing the extra tax burdens which they should pay to be assumed by the American people, I sometimes wonder if it is not for the best interest of America to discontinue cooperating with those foreign nations. However, in view of the fact that after March 4, the miracle man from the State of New York, President-elect Roosevelt, who is pledged to continue the international policy of foreign nations first and America second, as practiced under the last Democratic administration, is to take office, and in view of the fact that he takes office with a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, I shall support the appropriation and thereby again assist in keeping a solemn pledge of the Democratic Party which has been repudiated by the distinguished leader of that party, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman in favor of spending \$150,000 for a European conference where all the European debtors to this country will vote to cancel their debts owing to this country?

Mr. SCHAFER. No; I am not personally in favor of that, but the Democrats went before the people with their international policy of foreign nations and foreign peoples first and promised to carry out the foreign policy of the last Democratic administration. The people spoke and you have as President the miracle man from New York, you have the House, you have the Senate. I will assist in giving the Democratic Party rope enough to hang itself.

Mr. BLANTON. And we have the people with us, too.

Mr. SCHAFER. I am not going to let it be stated that a Republican, particularly a lame-duck Republican, lent assistance to help thwart the day of performance by the miracle man, Mr. Roosevelt, from arriving. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time some one got up in this House to defend the last word. [Laughter.] I have been in this House for 10 years, and I have heard gentlemen move to strike out the last word, which is probably the most futile motion that could be made. Suppose you do strike out the last word, another last word will crowd right in on you, and you can keep on ad infinitum, like the gentleman from Wisconsin—never through. [Laughter.]

The last word has about as many lives as all the cats in the world. In the New York State Legislature at one time a situation arose somewhat like the motion to strike out the last word. We had a disastrous train wreck in New York,

and some bright legislator there thought that the best way to stop train wrecks was to prevent rear-end collisions. So he put a bill in the New York State Legislature to take the last car off of trains. [Laughter.]

I hope that this distinctly antifeminist movement of motions to strike out the last word will stop in this House, and, particularly, I do not like to see my great friend from Wisconsin always engaged in this strictly antifeminist movement of striking out the last word.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman is seriously desirous of carrying out that proposition, under the rules of the House the gentleman can stop it by requiring those who are discussing this famous word to stick to the text.

Mr. BLACK. Of course, I believe in observing the parliamentary rules of the House, but when we get a gentleman like the gentleman from Wisconsin to make Republican speeches, I am willing to let him move to strike out as many last words and to offer as many amendments as he wants to, because every time he talks we Democrats gain a million votes. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman rose in opposition to a motion to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman tell us why he is opposed to striking out the last word?

Mr. BLACK. Because the last word in this case happens to be "work." [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of sorrow that I announce the death of a former Representative of the thirtieth congressional district of New York, the Hon. Cyrus Durey, of Pine Lake, N. Y. He served in the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses from March 4, 1907, to March 3, 1911. His immediate family and the State of New York have lost a devoted friend and a leader whose loss is well nigh irreparable. His especial attributes were courage, fortitude, and fidelity. He has passed from this vale of tears to the shadowland of immortality.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

Salaries: For an additional amount for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1933, \$21,900.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures "\$21,900" for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I would like to know if any part of this \$21,900 is to be used to continue the work of raising the terrace in front of the Agricultural Department? The reason I ask the question is that on the recommendation of the Park and Planning Commission Congress appropriated \$100,000—it was really a commitment to appropriate a million and a half dollars—to raise the terrace in front of the Department of Agriculture Building.

As I understand it, they did not consult the engineers, and at a later date, to their surprise, the engineers discovered that if they put any more earth on the foundation of the Washington Monument there was extreme danger that the foundation would tumble. The engineers had recommended very strongly against the raising of that terrace. The \$100,000 has been spent and wasted if this be true, as they can

not possibly proceed unless they take down the Monument and strengthen the foundation. This would cost \$2,000,000.

Now, here is how the Monument is brought into the picture. The plan was after the Department of Agriculture's terrace had been raised to likewise raise the terrace around the Monument and east of Twelfth Street, intending to place both Fourteenth Street and Twelfth Street underground. You might place Twelfth Street underground, but you never will place Fourteenth Street underground for the reason, as stated, it will endanger the foundation of the Monument to place additional weight thereon. The foundation extends for many feet out from the base of the Monument. It is none too secure now.

I thought that if there is any of this money going to be used to raise the terrace it might be a good idea to strike it out.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is made to enable the engineers to take care of the Hurley-Wright Building and also the building at Eighteenth and E Streets. It was not contemplated at the beginning of the fiscal year that these particular buildings would be occupied. They have been occupied by some new activity and it was found necessary to make this appropriation.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I hope that when the subcommittee on the independent offices appropriation bill holds hearings the members will go into this matter; this extravagant waste of \$100,000 in raising the terrace when they are not going to be able to complete the project. They should have learned in advance if the project was feasible. If the engineers are called in, they will explain the situation.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergency relief of residents, District of Columbia: For the purpose of affording relief to residents of the District of Columbia who are unemployed or otherwise in distress because of the existing emergency, to be expended by the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, by loan, employment, and/or direct relief, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Commissioners, and without regard to the provisions of any other law, payable from the revenues of the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1933, \$625,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses, including necessary personal services.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 13, strike out the figures "\$50,000" and insert "\$10,000."

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking to cut off any of the amount of the appropriation, but it does seem to me that this amount of \$50,000 as expenses for administering the expenditure of \$625,000 is very excessive. That is practically 10 per cent, what a lawyer charges for collecting money.

Now, this is for relief of the distressed, not for the relief of the professional philanthropist. I had an experience the other day with one of these philanthropists. There was an old woman about 70 years old who came here to visit her son. She became ill and needed hospital treatment, which her son was unable to provide. After going through the several departments I ran into one of these philanthropists, a woman in the bureau of placements, and all she offered was the suggestion that the woman had no business leaving home, no business to visit her son, and that she better get on the train and go home. If this is the kind of consideration the distressed are going to get through a Member of Congress, I can imagine what the individual gets. It seemed to me that \$10,000 is an ample amount to distribute \$625,000. My amendment does not take a cent off the principal but reduces the sum that goes into the hands of the professional workers. This fund is for distress relief, not for salaries, and should be spent for that purpose.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that the committee recommended \$50,000 at the request of the commissioner of public welfare and a long list of distinguished and prominent citizens of the District of Columbia who appeared in behalf of these appropriations and also at the instance of the Bureau of the

Budget which figured on \$100,000 on the basis of \$1,250,000 appropriation. Let me say that when this proposal was first submitted I had the same impression under which the gentleman from Virginia labors.

That is, that it seemed to be a very large overhead for the administration of this amount of money, but may I call my friend's attention to the fact that it simply says that the money shall not exceed this amount. But an explanation was made which to my mind was fully conclusive on the subject. They called the attention of the committee to the fact that in the distribution of a fund like this they had to be exceedingly careful to prevent frauds being perpetrated in the procurement of the money, that strangers made application and probably in a day or two would come back under another name and make application and, therefore, that it was necessary to keep a corps of investigators to make a personal investigation of those who applied for this fund before anything was done. In addition to that, people would come in and say "I have so many children, I need so much money for this purpose," or "I am living down here or up some alley and I have no coal or groceries," or something to that effect. The Board of Public Welfare of course, adopts the policy of sending some man or woman there who makes a personal investigation as to whether or not the facts stated are true, and then it comes to a conclusion as to how much is needed. The gentleman can understand under these circumstances that we might waste this fund if we did not appropriate enough money or rather authorize the expenditure of enough money to make a proper investigation to prevent fraud.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Does the gentleman realize that this \$50,000 would employ 20 people at \$2,500 each per year?

Mr. BYRNS. No.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. It does seem to me that this is an exceedingly large amount. Does the gentleman know what salaries these people get?

Mr. BYRNS. They have one executive, and there are about 6,000 families who get relief under this provision. Every one of those 6,000 families has to be investigated. Every person who applies has to be investigated, and the gentleman can see that they are a pretty busy lot of people down there.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I think we might be able to get along with less than 10 per cent of the total distribution for overhead.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. It seems so to me.

Mr. TABER. It seems as though we ought to cut that down. Perhaps the gentleman from Virginia has gone too far. Why not make it \$25,000 and see if we can not get a little more for direct relief. It seems to me that \$50,000 is a pretty large sum. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "\$50,000" and inserting "\$25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER to the amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Page 4, line 13, strike out "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, this work is done as cheaply as possible. I would like to see every dollar go to the relief of somebody, but I think we are liable to let our judgment run away with us if we undertake to limit the people down there in the investigations they make. These funds come wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia. They do not come out of the Treasury of the United States. Representatives of the District appeared before us. The commissioner of public welfare appeared before us. Mr. Newbold Noyes, of the Evening Star, appeared before us, and Mr. Delano and a number of other very distinguished gentlemen and citizens of the District. They all insisted that this sum was necessary in order to enable them to make the investigations necessary to be made to prevent fraud being committed. They do not know whether they will use all of this money or not. I assume from the high character of

those men and women who appeared that they will not use one dollar that is not absolutely necessary; but I do think it would be a very serious mistake if we should appropriate this great sum of money for the next six months and fail to allow a sufficient sum to enable those administering it to make an investigation so that no fraud may be perpetrated by any of those who now are coming daily to apply for funds.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Is this fund distributed through the community chest?

Mr. BYRNS. No. This has nothing to do with the community chest. A year ago they appeared before the committee, and Congress reduced their appropriation from \$600,000 to \$350,000. They did not have enough money to get through, and the community chest donated out of its charity fund \$100,000 to supplement the \$350,000 appropriated for the District. This has no relation to the community chest but will be administered by the commissioner of public welfare or, rather, by the Board of Public Welfare, which is an official agency in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice on page 47 of the hearings a breakdown as to the administrative expenses for this service. The pay roll for the month as of August 1, 1932, amounted to \$2,488.32. I am not rising in criticism of the salaries paid. I am sympathetic with the purpose of having supervising official inspect the way that these funds are used. I know of my own personal knowledge, in the city of Detroit, out of \$20,000,000 used for relief last year, there were persons getting money from the fund there who were receiving 65 cents an hour under permanent employment. I know the need of having some supervision, but if, as shown by the breakdown on page 47 of the hearings, the pay roll is \$2,488 for one month, why should we do violence by cutting down the appropriation to \$25,000?

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman will turn to pages 48 and 49, he will get a picture of the 1933 organization, which shows a pay roll for 12 months of \$91,519, and other expenses, which includes fuel, light, telephone, ice, and so forth, \$11,616, or a total of \$103,136.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will notice that in that itemization there are included expenses for furniture and equipment, \$3,400; stationery and supplies, \$3,500, and the like. The appropriation of \$50,000 is predicated on the idea that \$625,000 will be appropriated in the District appropriation bill, I suppose?

Mr. BYRNS. No. That is a matter for the regular bill. This is not predicated upon the idea that the regular bill will carry that sum. Personally I think it ought to carry it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I gleaned the idea from reading the report of the committee that this is merely the amount necessary for a six months' period, leaving it for the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations to appropriate some sum to match that amount. So that I think this amount of \$50,000 could be scaled somewhat without doing violence to the work.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my substitute amendment.

An appropriation was made to take care of distress in the District of Columbia in the regular appropriation bill which was passed for the fiscal year 1933. That appropriation, in so far as it relates to the actual relief of distress, is exhausted, but there is still provided for, as I understand, the

operating expenses of the welfare or charity department of the District of Columbia. Now, by this bill we are providing for \$625,000 additional funds to take care of the relief of distressed. It is absolutely a ridiculous thing that it costs so much money to administer the relief of distress. It is provided here that they can go to \$50,000, which is practically 10 per cent of the total allotment. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD] proposed that it be reduced from \$50,000 to \$10,000, and I offered an amendment to the gentleman's amendment making it \$25,000, so that there could be, within all reason, no necessity for going further. I do not want to prevent the proper administration of this fund, but it stands to reason that with the funds left to take care of the regular operation of the welfare department they ought to be able to do most of the work with that, and they ought not dip into this particular fund more than \$25,000 to administer it. We must get relief, regardless of whether it is for the District of Columbia or anywhere else, on a basis where it is not costing so much to administer.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about economy during the last session and the present session of this Congress, but those who are really interested in economy can not do anything else except support this \$50,000 allowance.

I have been complaining about too much economy, because I believe some people in the country have gone economy mad, but those who are sincerely for economy, to my mind, can not do anything except support this \$50,000, for the reason that these investigators in the welfare department, whether in Washington or your home cities or towns, are those who are the real economists of the country. They are the ones who go into the homes and find out whether a man has an automobile or whether he is working part-time during the week or whether he has been working full time or whether he is not working at all. They are the ones who save the money right from the start. None of us wants anyone who is in need to be deprived of sustenance or deprived of aid, but at the same time we want the thing to be run right. We want the investigators to be able to go to the homes and find out whether the people are justly receiving aid, or whether they are trying to put something over on the welfare department.

These funds come out of the District of Columbia and not out of the Treasury of the United States. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stated that this welfare board came and asked for a reduction of their appropriation when they thought they could reduce it. Now, when they are in greater need of the appropriation is the time to watch and see that the appropriations are paid out in the proper manner to people who deserve them, and that the underserving will be taken off the welfare pay roll and the money will go to those who are entitled to have it.

Mr. HOLADAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. HOLADAY. If the gentleman will permit in his time, I would like to state that last year when this appropriation was made a 10 per cent limit was put on for personal service, because this was an entirely new work being undertaken by the Department of Public Welfare. When they came in this year they showed to the committee they were using slightly less than 8 per cent. So this was fixed at \$50,000 in order to permit them to go ahead with the present organization. Personally, I feel that about 8 per cent, which this represents as being used for personal service, guarantees a wise and economical expenditure of the \$625,000.

Mr. CONNERY. I agree with the distinguished gentleman. I believe this is an economical expenditure of the funds of the Welfare Board of the District of Columbia and that we are guarding against the goldbricker who is not entitled to get that money. The only way we can do it is by means of investigators, and their work should be encouraged and provided for as in this appropriation.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Has the gentleman any idea how many investigators there are and what their salaries are?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can inform the gentleman. There are 41.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. And what are their salaries?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. One draws \$166 a month; 2 get \$145 a month; 6 get \$135 a month; 10 get \$110 a month, and 12 get \$75 a month.

Mr. CONNERY. Another thing: Disregarding for the time being that these investigators are making a clean-up of the quacks who should not be on the pay roll, you are also taking care of people who will not ask for aid, and unless some one's attention is called to it people will actually go hungry without going to the welfare board. If the investigators find those people they are given food and clothing.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. But the number of employees indicated here would not take anything like \$50,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; this statement here is right.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the amendment. I am sure if the committee will only reflect a moment and consider the purposes of this fund it will realize the necessity of a proper, intelligent, and honest administration.

I am sure that the percentage overhead pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois, of 8 per cent and less, compares very favorably with similar work in cities comparable in size to Washington, D. C.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this fund is relief, and when relief is needed it is needed promptly. Unless there are proper and sufficient supervisory officials and trained investigators, what will happen? Applicants will come in for relief and money will be handed out indiscriminately. Anyone can hand out money; that is not difficult. The purpose is to weed out the meritorious cases and the cases mostly in need and to clear these cases in order to avoid duplication. Very often it is found—and I am speaking from my experience in New York City—that unless there is a proper clearing of cases some families receive duplicate relief and other families remain absolutely without any care. Beside direct temporary relief, an important part of this work is permanent rehabilitation and readjustment of the family. Many family problems are to be considered and assisted.

A careful analysis of the working force here will indicate that for a city of the population of Washington, D. C., and the peculiar conditions existing here the force is not overmanned at all. Unless there is some supervision, unless there is investigation, there will be abuses, on the one hand, as pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], and, on the other hand, needy families waiting to have their cases investigated and remaining without needed aid. Now, it seems to me that the family-adjustment work of this department is also very important. Very often it is the adjustment which puts the family again on an existing basis rather than the direct relief.

I want to submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we are going to cut down the administrative force, and it is down as low as in any city I know of, it will result in abuse and misapplication of these funds. When I say misapplication, I mean indiscriminate parceling out of the funds as long as they last regardless of the need or merit of the applicant. The very purpose of the appropriation would be destroyed.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman also knows these investigators check up after aid has been given people, from week to week and from month to month, and when the people are again at work and do not need the relief any more the relief is stopped.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is the very purpose of this force.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. TABER. According to the hearings, on page 44, there is now, outside of the emergency-relief proposition involving something like 70 employees, another 69 employees, which means a total of 130 people to administer \$625,000 during a period of six months.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; just one moment, right there. I am not referring to your out-nursing, and that, of course, is personal service. Naturally there is nursing, playground work, and all sorts of social-service work in addition to purely administrative work. Surely that can not be included in administrative expenses.

Mr. TABER. There are no nurses on this list.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the work performed under this appropriation to the extent of \$350,000 appropriated last year is something entirely new, never carried on at all; it is a new proposition entirely. Therefore, they went out and made a new organization. You had the same thing here last year. They put in the 10 per cent limitation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think it is very low.

Mr. HOLADAY. And when they came in this year the Director of Public Welfare indicated that he had his organization functioning at about 8 per cent. Therefore it was placed at \$50,000 to permit the organization to go ahead as it is now functioning.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLGOOD: Page 4, line 1, strike out the section.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I, of course, am in favor of charity and am in favor of taking care of the distressed, but it seems to me that there is an injustice in this appropriation. Here is \$625,000 being asked by the District of Columbia for its Welfare Department. There are nine charity departments that are taking care of the distressed in the District of Columbia. The community chest has raised the sum of \$1,800,000 for taking care of the distressed. Then besides this there are eight other charitable departments and you can see that there is bound to be some overriding of authority with some duplication in relief.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLGOOD. I yield.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman know just what the community chest uses its funds for and how much of that fund is used for administrative purposes?

Mr. ALLGOOD. No; I do not; but the hearings reveal that two of the workers of the community chest receive salaries of \$5,000 each out of the funds that are raised for the community chest; and it was stated that \$100,000 had been transferred from the community chest to this welfare fund last year.

Now, here is the point I am driving at: You are asking Congress for a dole, for a direct appropriation of \$625,000 to be given to the District of Columbia. You are not asking for it for the people back home. The people in the counties, towns, cities, and States of the Nation are required by this Congress to get their relief from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Congress requires them to pay it back to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. But this appropriation of \$625,000 is not a loan but a gift. It does come from the taxes raised from the people of the District of Columbia, but Congress comes along and appropriates \$7,500,000 to the District of Columbia directly out of the Federal Treasury. If we did not have to meet this gift of \$625,000 to charity, we could cut the appropriation down to

\$7,000,000 from the Federal Treasury for the District of Columbia.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLGOOD. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. This \$625,000 comes out of the revenue of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I understand it comes out of their own revenue, but we appropriate \$7,500,000 out of the Treasury for the District of Columbia, and if it were not for this appropriation of \$625,000 we could cut that appropriation down to \$7,000,000; so, after all, the Federal Treasury pays it. They are not appropriating any money for charity down in my State or in the gentleman's State out of the Federal Treasury. We are having to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I called the Red Cross this morning and they told me they were taking care of the families of soldiers in the District of Columbia and that none of these families were having to suffer, because they were taking care of them. Of course, it is not coming directly out of the Treasury, but it is coming out of the Treasury through a circuitous route, and the people are paying for it out of their taxes and then Congress is reimbursing the District with a direct appropriation out of the Treasury. If you are going to appropriate \$625,000 for the District of Columbia, why not come along and take care of the people throughout the Nation who are in distress?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am astounded that any Member of this House would rise to strike out this entire item which is asked as charity for the suffering and the unemployed people of the District of Columbia.

As the chairman has pointed out, not one dollar of this money comes out of the Federal Treasury. It all comes out of funds of the District of Columbia. In other words, a person who undertakes to keep this money away from the District of Columbia to take care of the situation would take the position of preventing the city council of my city or the legislature of my State from taking care of the poor and needy of my State or of my city. And I am glad that I can say that this is not the sentiment of my home city which is appropriating large sums to care for unemployed and their needy families. Further, there is no way for these people to get money unless the Congress appropriates it in this way.

Mr. BURTNES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. BURTNES. I was just going to ask the gentleman whether the public authorities in his State, whether it be the counties or the cities or the State itself, raise money for the relief of the poor within their own communities.

Mr. PATTERSON. They have to raise the money in that way. My county is having to raise money now for this purpose.

Mr. BURTNES. And is it not true that unless the money is raised by public taxation they have to pass the hat in order to have the matter taken care of?

Mr. PATTERSON. Absolutely.

Mr. BURTNES. And that is true of the District of Columbia as well as of many other communities.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman has rendered a great service to the State of Alabama by taking the floor against the pending amendment and sending word to the country that the people of Alabama do not want the needy to suffer or to die of starvation.

Mr. PATTERSON. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is always active for relief of those who are in need, for his comment, and I want to say further that some of these people who are being fed here in the District are from my State, as well as other States of this country, and I repeat that there is no way to provide one dollar of relief except by making this appropriation. The situation here

is not like it is in my city or State where the legislature or city council may act. There is no way for these people to get one dollar or one dime unless it comes by reason of action by this Congress, and I am surprised that any Member of this House would try to make a record to carry back to his district by proposing to strike out such a provision and try to keep the people of the District of Columbia, out of their own funds, from feeding the starving and poor people of their community. My heart goes out to the needy of every section, including the District, but I shall not oppose this worthy appropriation because I can not get a bill passed to take care of the needy by providing work and other ways to care for those whose hearts go out to us to-day. If I have got to try to make a record in this way to come to Congress, I am ready to be defeated now. I hope the amendment does not get a single vote. [Applause.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to prolong this discussion, but unfortunately this appropriation was referred to by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD] as charity. I think this is a most unfortunate use of the word, because it is not charity. This is the point I want to leave in connection with this discussion. It is the duty of the community to care for its unfortunate citizens in a time of financial crisis who, through no fault of their own, become destitute. The highest function of government is the preservation of life.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In just a moment I will yield.

Then there is this confusion between the functions of the so-called community chest and the appropriations made by Congress as the municipal government of the District of Columbia. The community chest is a permanent fund raised by voluntary contributions for the purpose of maintaining permanent establishments doing social, welfare, and educational work, and when the community is confronted with a depression or a situation such as we are in now, it becomes the duty of the government, whether National, State, or county, to step in and prevent American citizens from starving to death. That is the welfare work—that is the appropriation we are now discussing. It has nothing to do with the community chest.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I agree with the gentleman absolutely.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLGOOD. But are you going to make pig out of one and puppy out of the other? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] when Congress convened last year brought in a resolution asking for \$50,000,000 for charity—

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Do not use the word "charity," please.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Well, to aid the poor of this country.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. For relief.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Did we get it?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No. I was in favor of it and still am.

Mr. ALLGOOD. No; we did not get it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But we are not out of this depression, unfortunately, yet.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Now you come here and give to the people of the District of Columbia \$625,000 when you give the people back home nothing. You are spending in the District of Columbia \$330,000,000 for buildings as against \$342,000,000 throughout all the States, and the biggest pay rolls in the country are here in this city. One hundred and fifty-two million dollars is spent by the Government in pay rolls for employees here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Now that the gentleman has got that all out of his system, I hope he feels better; but let me say that in this instance we are acting as a board of aldermen or as a city council, or anything you may care to call it, for the city of Washington, and the word "charity" is improper to be used in connection with funds of this kind which are to afford necessary relief for a large portion of our population, the innocent victims of a financial collapse.

Now, I agree that we should have stepped in long before this and adequately provided relief for the preservation of

life just as we do in time of war when we appropriate for the destruction of life. We should now, in the midst of this economic war, provide relief, especially for little children who are now getting improper and insufficient nourishment and who will pay for it in the next generation. We should provide in order to prevent families from being disrupted. That is the highest function of government, and we ought to stand up and not begrudge an appropriation to provide enough for destitute families in the Capital of the greatest Nation in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: In line 13, page 4, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$10,000."

Mr. GOSS. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. That amendment has been voted upon already.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I make it \$20,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 13, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$20,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the ridiculous feature about this provision is the overhead expense of \$50,000 that is allowed for administering this fund.

My friend sitting in front of me knows when we held a hearing on this matter last year it developed that the community chest had laid an assessment on all Government workers for this welfare work. They then raised over \$2,000,000 for relief in the District of Columbia.

We brought some of their officials before us and we wanted to know something about the overhead, about the salaries they were drawing. It developed that some of these welfare workers were drawing salaries of \$5,000 each per annum.

The committee asked them for a breakdown of their overhead showing all salaries paid, and they said it was none of the business of Congress. They would not furnish Congress with a breakdown of the salaries that they were paying.

We already have an organization for administering such relief funds. Why should we spend an additional \$50,000 for the administration of this additional fund? It is ridiculous.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will turn to page 47 of the hearings, he will find the amount they spent for distribution in six months. Does not the gentleman think they ought to have one employee for disbursing every dollar?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has the right slant on it, and if he had been on the subcommittee last year when the hearings were held, he would see how much money is wasted on overhead.

Mr. TABER. I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment; but the way the discussion has taken place here, one would think they needed one employee to look after the disbursement of every dollar.

Mr. BLANTON. I think we should cut it down from \$50,000 to \$5,000, and the fund would be better administered.

Mr. DYER. Why not let the District Commissioners disburse it?

Mr. BLANTON. We have at present officers who are now engaged in that work. They could distribute it without additional overhead.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I think we have consumed enough time on this paragraph. Everybody understands it. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD].

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. I simply introduced the amendment to bring forth the disparity that exists between

legislation in behalf of the District and legislation in behalf of the people back home.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 1, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses (fighting and preventing forest fires): For an additional amount for fighting and preventing forest fires, fiscal year 1933, including the same objects specified under this head in the agricultural appropriation act for the year 1933, \$1,000,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. This has the appearance of an additional appropriation for this purpose. What is the special reason for this additional million dollars?

Mr. BYRNS. This is money that has already been expended to take care of about 8,000 fires that occurred last fall in the various forest reservations and national parks.

Mr. DOWELL. The money has already been expended?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. The gentleman understands, of course, that there is always a nominal sum appropriated for the purpose of fighting forest fires, for the reason that no one knows whether any will occur, or, if they do occur, how much will be needed. It so happened that we had about 8,000 fires last fall. They expended about \$883,000, and this will leave them \$118,000 to carry on to July 1, and also to take care of what they used out of other funds.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Detection and prosecution of crimes: The amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia from the appropriation "Detection and prosecution of crimes, 1933," is hereby increased from \$477,356 to \$523,851.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. This is a transfer as I understand it from the field service to the District of Columbia. Is that correct?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. It seems to me it is merely an additional appropriation for work in the District of Columbia and will be added to the appropriation and taken from the field service.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It does not increase the appropriation.

Mr. DOWELL. That may be, but we are increasing the force in the District of Columbia and there will be a continuing increase in the appropriation.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It will not work an increase in appropriations, as will be shown in the bill which the committee expects soon to report for 1934. The work of the fingerprint division has been very much extended and the bureau is entering a wider field of work, much to the efficiency of the service. On that account it was found necessary to provide a large sum to be expended in the District of Columbia where the work is now centralized.

Mr. DOWELL. In answer to the gentleman, after reading the testimony of the committee, I find that this decreases the amount in the field, and while this may not continue to increase appropriations in the District of Columbia, that has been the experience on every appropriation that has been made.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am of the opinion that the fingerprint division requires some increases in the future, as its work grows, and Congress approves what I think the bureau is wisely endeavoring to do.

Mr. DOWELL. What is that?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We are transferring a part of the field appropriation to care for work in the District which the committee feels is important.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are continuing to add to the expenditures in the District of

Columbia in every one of these appropriation bills. This appropriation should not be increased for the District of Columbia; they should come within the limits of that appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The officers in the gentleman's home county can send a fingerprint here of some criminal they have caught, and they can have a report back from the office here in Washington that will leave here in 30 minutes after the fingerprint gets here, and in that way they are identifying criminals with national records in every locality in every State in the Union. It is splendid work.

Mr. DOWELL. And they were given the amount that was shown to be necessary in the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. They are aiding officers in every State.

Mr. DOWELL. It seems to me that we ought not to proceed to add to that appropriation. There has not been anything shown in the testimony that there is any emergency that makes it necessary at present. It is an attempt merely to add to that appropriation, and it will continue in the future if this testimony is correct.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The chairman in charge of the deficiency appropriation for the Department of Justice asked me to be present at the time this hearing was had.

Our subcommittee had gone very fully into this transfer of appropriation and felt that the transfer was justified. I so stated to the subcommittee handling the deficiency bill. I do not think any increase in 1934 will be asked.

Mr. DOWELL. Will there be a corresponding decrease in the other part of the appropriation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There will be reflected in the field appropriation a larger decrease than is involved in this transfer.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. In addition to what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] has said it was stated by the Director of the Bureau of Special Investigations that they are receiving about 2,000 fingerprints a day. The gentleman, of course, realizes that unless they are in a position to promptly dispose of those fingerprints and give information back to the gentleman's town or other section of the country, the information is worthless because if this information is not furnished promptly some criminal may be permitted to escape. The statement was made that unless this appropriation was carried it would delay the furnishing of this information three or four weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have two additional minutes. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. DYER. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] a question. One of those gentlemen stated that this bureau is now receiving in the neighborhood of 2,000 fingerprints a day. Do we understand from that that crime is so rampant and is on such a great increase that this is the result of it?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No. It rather reflects the interest that the States are showing in the work of the fingerprint bureau, and they are now cooperating in a splendid way.

Mr. DYER. It is very much of a duplication, because I know my own State maintains its own fingerprint system.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. But here we are gathering together the fingerprints of every State in the Union. The gentleman's State does not gather the fingerprints of other States. They only gather fingerprints for criminals in Mis-

souri. We are providing a central agency so that the gentleman's State may have the benefit of fingerprints from every State.

Mr. DYER. I know the system, and I have a very high regard for it and for its efficiency; but I was surprised at the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that 2,000 fingerprints are coming here every day, when we have been told that if we passed prohibition crime would cease and practically end. Now, it has increased greatly. I would like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to explain why we have so many crimes nowadays, and we did not have anything to compare with it before prohibition was enacted.

Mr. BLANTON. I will answer that in a few minutes when I am given time.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I was interested in the attitude expressed by the gentleman to keep down appropriations. Every member of our committee is interested in that. The gentleman from Iowa will be interested to know that this is one bureau that is really efficiently administered, and in the fiscal year 1932 there will be a substantial sum turned back into the Treasury at the end of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The members of our committee are in sympathy with the attitude of the gentleman from Iowa as to the necessity of reducing appropriations, and we have not recommended this transfer with any idea of making increased appropriations hereafter. It happens that this bureau has been efficiently administered during the present year, and as a result there will be a substantial return to the Treasury at the end of the year from the appropriations carried for 1933. That is what we had hoped would prove true in many other bureaus.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama, this is recurring on nearly all of the appropriation bills. At the conclusion of the year they are asking for transfers of expenditures in some department to go somewhere else to increase that department. There has been a great deal of criticism of the number of appropriations being made for the District of Columbia, and this is an additional appropriation for that purpose. I think we have arrived at the time, if we are going to have real economy, where the departments should understand they will not be permitted to increase the appropriation from the regular appropriation given them when it was given at the beginning of the year. I think that should be established, and I believe we ought to establish it by striking out the paragraph at this time and letting the department go along on the amount that has already been appropriated for it.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman does not think this is an emergency on crime?

Mr. DOWELL. There has been no showing and no testimony that there has been anything aside from the regular routine business.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Tennessee said they had increased their force on the fingerprint work.

Mr. DOWELL. They will increase their force to any amount the money is appropriated for. That is exactly what I am trying to argue. Whenever we make an additional appropriation we will have additional employment, and we will have to appropriate for it next year, because it will become a necessity.

I think we ought to stop this right here. It is a clear case of adding an additional amount to an amount which has been heretofore regularly appropriated and the amount the Appropriations Committee found was necessary when it made the appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] has asked me a pertinent question. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and his fingerprint bureau are doing some of the most valuable work that has been done in the Nation. When my good friend from Missouri found there was a gang of automobile thieves operating in his twelfth district of Missouri and elsewhere in the United States, he got his Dyer bill passed here in this Congress providing that whenever they took a stolen automobile across a State line it became a Federal offense. When one of his automobile thieves in his twelfth district brings an automobile from Kansas, Arkansas, or Oklahoma into Missouri, the officers there catch him and fingerprint him, and they send those fingerprints up here to J. Edgar Hoover. He checks them up with his classified list and locates the criminal, and usually he finds that for 15 years the accused has been violating the laws of the United States. For instance, he committed robbery somewhere in Oklahoma 15 years ago; he committed murder somewhere else two or three years later; he escaped from some penitentiary and stole three or four automobiles and went back to the twelfth district of Missouri, and you find a great list of crimes that the bunch of automobile thieves operating in that twelfth district have been guilty of.

Does not my friend from Missouri think it is worth while for the officers of his district to have access to this kind of information? Why, it is valuable information that has been gathered to aid the officers of every State of this Union. This is the information J. Edgar Hoover is furnishing to all States daily.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield, but let me say that I voted for my friend's bill. It was a good bill.

Mr. DYER. I want to add my indorsement to the fine work that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and his bureau are doing, and to say that, next to Herbert Hoover, he is one of the finest public officials we ever had.

Mr. BLANTON. It was not his fault that his name was "Hoover." He is doing a good work, nevertheless, as the head of our secret service, in spite of his name.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGUGIN: Strike out the enacting clause of the bill.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional five minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not press his request. I am not going to object, but I am going to say this: We have reached the point where we must confine ourselves to a 5-minute rule. We have been pretty liberal, but we want to get through with this bill, and I do not think the House ought to have to sit here indefinitely. I am not going to object now, but I hope the gentleman will confine himself to five minutes unless he is talking about something pertaining to this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's request that he may proceed out of order or just to extend the time to 10 minutes?

Mr. McGUGIN. My request, Mr. Chairman, is that I may be allowed an additional five minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he is going to address

himself to the subject matter of this bill or to the subject he was discussing yesterday?

Mr. McGUGIN. No; I am not going to touch the subject I talked on yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, here is the situation in which we find our country: We ran a deficit for one year and for that I am not going to criticize any Congress. We ran a deficit for two years; for that I am not going to criticize any Congress. We are now running a deficit for a third consecutive year. For this I do criticize a Congress and the Congress which I criticize is this Congress, the first session of the Seventy-second Congress. It refused to economize as much as was possible and proper and refused to provide enough revenue to meet the expenses incurred. Now we are doing the same thing for the fourth consecutive year.

In the appropriation bills which we are passing in this session we are providing for the expenditures for the next fiscal year, and there is no man on this floor but what knows that this Congress will never pass a revenue bill providing sufficient revenue to meet these expenditures, and this means a fourth consecutive year that the Government of the United States is not meeting its obligations as it goes. It means that the current expenses of this Government are going over into the national debt, and when the current expenses go over into the national debt what does that mean? Is that the end of it? No. It means that our children one day must pay the current expenses of the Government during your time and my time; and a generation of people who are so devoid of character that they are willing for four consecutive years to pass the current expenses of government on to their children to pay are as devoid of character as a parent who is willing to die leaving his grocery bills unpaid.

We can not follow this course without breaking alike faith with our forbears and our children. The men and women on this floor have never paid one penny of taxes to help pay the current expenses, in peace time, of government during the days of their fathers. But here we are passing current expenditures on to our children. We are not going to hand our children a government such as our fathers handed to us, and that is not playing the game square. We can not go on following this policy.

Let me say that it is not only morally wrong, but it is economically wrong; and it seems to be written into the scheme of things by the God of Nations that no generation can carry on such a policy of breaking faith with its children without that generation then and there suffering despair such as we are now suffering. I do not care how this Budget is balanced, let us balance it. I am ready to vote for any revenue bill that will bring in sufficient money to meet the expenses of my Government, but that is not what we are doing. There is only one way in which the Budget can be balanced and that is for the President to send his message to Congress demanding the appropriations he wants and the revenue he wants to meet those appropriations. Then such a President must have the power to force his program through Congress.

I do not believe there will ever be a President in the White House who will send to Congress a Budget which he knows is not balanced. Mr. Hoover has sent us a Budget, but the Congress will not accept his revenue recommendations. Why? You can not find anybody who wants to pay taxes, but you will sit here and pass the appropriations because you can find people who want the money out of the Treasury.

Here is the situation. If this Government goes into another year with an unbalanced Budget, that responsibility rests upon the shoulders of this Congress. You will not take Mr. Hoover's program. Let us wait until after the 4th of March. Let Mr. Roosevelt send his Budget to Congress, and I believe the next Congress will take it and provide enough revenue to meet the expenses. I do not be-

lieve Mr. Roosevelt will ever send a Budget to this Congress wherein he asks for more expenditures than he does revenue. This is our only hope to balance the Budget of this country short of June 30, 1934.

I do not believe we can go four consecutive years with an unbalanced Budget. Everyone knows that the Government can not go on indefinitely in this way. How many years this Government can do it, of course, no one knows. It is only problematical, but I do not believe we can continue the way we are going. Mind you, last year we went in debt 57 cents every time we spent a dollar. Fifty-seven cents of every dollar paid to you and me as salary must one day be paid by another generation. This is not playing the game square or right with the future, and my appeal is not to pass the appropriations in this Congress, because we all know this Congress is not going to pass a revenue bill which will meet the appropriations.

Mr. Roosevelt, calling a few leaders up to New York, is not going to give us a revenue bill that will balance the Budget. The only way he can do this is to send a message to this Congress that the country and the Members may read. This is the only way we can get at it. This is the constitutional way.

The trouble is our personal interests in reelection stand in the way of a proper revenue bill. Let me give you an illustration. Last year when the House turned down the sales tax, the majority leader, Mr. RAINEY, stood on this floor and said that no legislative body ever took as long a step toward communism as this House did the day before he spoke when it turned down the sales tax. According to the morning paper, he is not now in favor of any new taxes. Well, this is the difference between the man who is now a candidate for Speaker and when he stood here a year ago serving only his country.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGUGIN. No.

That is where the trouble comes in trying to balance this Budget. We can not find any voters who want to pay taxes. The only tax anyone seems to be willing to vote is the beer tax, because there are some people who are willing to pay a beer tax, and they will take that, Constitution or no Constitution; but this House will not vote any other revenue bill because it requires some new revenue which must be paid in taxes.

There was a Member who sat in this House once, I understand, who voted for all appropriations and against all revenue bills. For my part I am going to stand in this House and vote against all appropriations until there is reasonable assurance of sufficient revenue to meet the appropriations, to the end that my country is meeting its obligations as it goes, and our children will not have to pay our current expenses of government.

The responsibility of an unbalanced Budget until June 30, 1934, rests upon this House. It is not going to rest upon my shoulders because I am going to do everything in my power to stop these appropriations until the time that this Congress or a future Congress is willing to come in here and perform its constitutional duty of providing enough revenue to run this Government.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished Republican gentleman from Kansas indicated that the Democratic leader, Mr. RAINEY, is to be the next Speaker of the House. The gentleman, apparently, did not read the press this morning, which indicated that the former Governor of New York, Hon. Alfred E. Smith, might be the next Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I wish the gentleman from Kansas—from dry, arid Kansas—would have been as much taken up with the necessity of raising revenue to help balance the Budget when we had the beer-before-Christmas bill before us.

Of course, in Wisconsin and in other States the Democrats promised that if the people elected a Democratic President and provided a large Democratic majority in the House and

in the Senate, we would have a good 5-cent glass of potent beer before Christmas. Christmas has come and gone; we are still drinking near beer, one-half of 1 per cent, at 25 cents a bottle, and the beer bill has not been speeded on its way to the White House for action, notwithstanding the fact that the Democrats have a majority in the House of Representatives and a majority in the Senate when we take into consideration the Members of the other body, who, although they run for office on the Republican ticket, supported the next President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, in the last campaign.

The gentleman from Kansas a few moments ago said that until the Budget is balanced he would vote against all appropriations. I am anxiously waiting to hear the gentleman speak and observe his vote on the alleged farm relief bill—that giant, billion-dollar, super sales tax monstrosity of the Democratic Party—when it comes before the House within the next few days, particularly since that bill purports to furnish relief to the wheat farmers of the gentleman's State.

Let us see when this super sales tax monstrosity on bread and other food and clothing of the American people comes before the House whether the gentleman from Kansas will arise on the floor of the House and denounce that Democratic monstrosity and billion-dollar sales-tax levy and say, "Wait for the passage of this bill until the Budget is balanced."

Of course, we do not know whether we are going to get an opportunity to vote on that bill. The Democratic leaders have to go to New York and get their instructions from Roosevelt, the miracle man. I can not imagine how President-elect Roosevelt, this miracle man, will approve of this super sales tax monstrosity on the necessities of life in view of the statement that he was absolutely horrified when the Democrats in the House proposed to consider a small sales tax on products of industry excepting food, clothes, and so forth. May I suggest to the gentleman from Kansas that if he wants to help balance the Budget, let him go over in the other body and convert some of those dry statesmen from his and other States in favor of an early passage of the beer bill?

The gentleman is a member of the dry group led by Bishop Cannon, who opposed a nonintoxicating bucket of wholesome beer, although he is an expert on buckets, as proved by his speculations in the bucket shops of New York. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I want to give notice that hereafter I am going to object to any debate that is not confined to the subject matter of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Goss) there were 1 aye and 53 noes.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: The amount authorized to be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1933 from the appropriation for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Immigration, is hereby increased from \$300,000 to \$320,000.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 7, after the word "expenses" and the colon, strike out all the balance of the paragraph down to and including line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For an additional amount for the Bureau of Immigration to be expended for personal services and allowances in the District of Columbia and elsewhere during the fiscal year 1933, \$606,000, of which additional amount not to exceed \$50,000 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have at this time 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not object to the gentleman having five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNS. I object.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I ask to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, on December 8 I received a communication from the Department of Labor, signed by the Secretary, in the following language:

It is estimated that on the basis of removal of 25,000 aliens, at which rate approximately deportations are now proceeding, we will have a deficit at the close of the current fiscal year of approximately \$585,300 in deportation money, in addition to a deficit of approximately \$606,726 for salaries, making a total of \$1,192,000.26.

I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the Director of the Budget made a recommendation, so far as the item for deportation is concerned, amounting to over \$600,000, which is coming to us on the second deficiency appropriation bill, and at this point I am not interested in that phase of it.

What I am interested in now are the salaries of the personnel of the Immigration Service, which includes the immigration border patrol. We have in the service a total number of 3,669 men and women. The total amount of monthly pay roll is about \$653,240. There seems to be a deficiency in the amount available for the pay roll for the Immigration Service and for the border patrol, resulting in an estimated deficit of \$606,726. All the Secretary of Labor could do was to balance his budget by laying off 10 per cent of the whole service for a period of six months.

After a number of conferences the Secretary of Labor agreed to fix an administrative furlough for 30 days for all of them—this is over and above the regular legislative furlough—thereby penalizing this great service of immigration inspectors and border patrol in the amount of two months' pay instead of one month that is given to every other department in the Government. That is a discrimination that is not deserved by the Immigration Service. Those men are rendering a fine work. I was surprised to learn that some gentleman here in the early part of the day said that immigration was cut off and that we did not need the inspectors and that they do not want to supply the deficiency on that account. I challenge that statement.

In the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration covering the operations of the Immigration Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932—that is, June of this calendar year—the personnel of this Immigration Service boarded nearly 31,000 vessels and inspected over 951,000 alien seamen, besides ascertaining there were aboard over 333,000 American citizens serving as seamen. During that same year nearly 175,000 aliens of different immigration classifications were examined and records of entry made. Also records were made of over 287,000 aliens who left the United States. Also all the necessary proceedings were followed to effect the deportation of some 19,000 aliens, and over 10,000 aliens were permitted to leave voluntarily. In all, the facts regarding over 30,000 aliens amenable to deportation were given attention and examination.

So I am sure you will agree that there is still considerable need for the personnel services rendered by this bureau.

The fact is that they have not enough men on the force to prevent smuggling of dope peddlers and aliens. Ships are coming in every day. The immigration inspector has to be on the job early in the morning and late at night. Every person who enters the United States must be examined both by the Immigration and by the Customs Service, so that, so far as the Immigration Service is concerned, the men work almost 20 hours out of the 24, and in spite of that you want to penalize these men with an additional 30 days' furlough, and these men can not afford it.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. This 30 days' furlough of the immigration officials is in addition to the regular furlough that all the other departments get?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. So that they are penalized beyond any other department of the Government.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. And that came from the horizontal 10 per cent cut that took place in this appropriation bill last year?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did it not come from the stagger proposal advocated by the administration, instead of the straight 10 per cent cut in salaries advocated by the Economy Committee?

Mr. SNELL. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes.

Mr. SNELL. I would like to get accurate information about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Those who were advocating the economy program said that the stagger proposal would work an injustice, and in many instances it has worked an injustice.

Mr. SNELL. But this is in addition to the stagger proposal.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, this is in addition to the present legislative furlough given to all Government employees because the department was compelled by law to use up more money for deportation purposes. They are trying to balance their budget by taking it out of the men who are living from hand to mouth as a result of services rendered by the Immigration Service of the United States. I respectfully submit that because we had to use \$288,650 to deport a group of 2,200 to 2,300 Chinamen, undesirable aliens who were thrown on our shores from Mexico, it does not justify you or me in depriving these men of an additional month's pay, which, God knows, they can not afford.

The present cut we have given them under the economy plan is enough penalization without another month. But these men still get more than that. They only work five days a week. They do not work on Saturday. The Department of Labor is under a 5-day week, so that they get an additional furlough; and if you will figure it out, you will find that these men in the Immigration Service, who are the backbone of this country, are not alone getting a penalization of 52 days, but almost three months; and why should we discriminate against this class of fine men?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. And the penalization of these employees is not nearly so serious as the impairment of the service that will follow.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As a matter of fact, you may as well turn around and not appropriate anything. If you want this country flooded with cheap labor, Mexicans, Chinese, Filipinos, and everybody along that line, then stop appropriating this money. Some of these inspectors have been transferred from one point to another. Some of them have made long leases and some have bought furniture on the installment plan. They have tried to live within their means, even with the cut of the legislative furlough. If then we go to work and cut off an additional 30 days to the legislative furlough, in addition to that 5-day week, these men finally will have nothing to do but go out and peddle shoe laces, and I do not think they can sell them.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. In addition to what the gentleman said about the 5-day week, these men many times work for hours overtime and get no pay for it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They get no compensation at all for it, because the ships come in at all hours of the night. Those men must be on the job. That ship must be cleared. It has been called to my attention, as chairman of the Committee on Immigration, that there is greater hardship upon the Immigration Service than any other service in the country.

I am not quarreling with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman has a hard job before him; but I am presenting to the House a situation where we do not want the country to know that the Government is now going into the business of giving a lay-off to employees for six months and thereby set a bad example.

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. CABLE. When there was a 10 per cent cut in the various departments last year, instead of cutting 380,000 10 per cent they cut only 300,000.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct.

And, in addition, I wish to call to the attention of the House some figures just last Sunday published in the press of this city.

The Civil Service Commission reported to the Senate Economy Committee the force with which the administrative-furlough provision of the economy act is hitting the personnel of the Government services.

The employees of the State Department, the Treasury Department, the Post Office Department, the Government Printing Office, the Veterans' Administration, and 18 other Government establishments have not been subjected to loss of compensation resulting from an administrative furlough in addition to the legislative furlough.

The employees in the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the Interior Department, the Justice Department, the Navy Department, the War Department, the Labor Department, the White House, and 12 other Government establishments have had to accept administrative furloughs without pay over and above the time covered by the legislative furlough.

In those departments and establishments where administrative furloughs without pay have been resorted to there are estimated to be 172,592 employees, and of these about 20,015 were given a payless furlough.

From the figures appearing last Sunday it appears that over 81 per cent of the total number of employees given this payless administrative furlough are being paid a salary of less than \$3,000 each per year and only 3,679 have salaries of upward from \$3,000. So that the bulk of the salary loss to individual employees is laid upon those who get a normal salary of downward from \$3,000.

The Department of Commerce, with its 14,796 employees, furloughed 9,139 of them; while the Interior Department, with 12,511 employees, only furloughed 79. The Navy Department, with a personnel of 50,106, has only furloughed 1 person, while the War Department furloughed 732 out of its 47,349 total personnel.

The tabulation further indicates that the principle of administrative furloughs, which was held out as the embodiment of the spread-work idea, and could be applied to about 485,141 employees in the executive civil service, is, as a matter of actual application, reaching only about 4 per cent of that number, and these 4 per cent stand a loss totaling over \$4,000,000 of their normal annual income.

So I say, in closing, that the discrimination evidenced by a 30-day furlough without pay to the personnel of the Bureau of Immigration, the immigration-inspector personnel, and the members of the immigration border patrol is wholly unjust, and this amendment should have the support of every Member.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who is the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, has stated this case so well that there is very little that I care to add.

Those Members who live in border States are familiar with the type of work that is done by the immigration officers, whether those officers serve in the patrol service or are immigration inspectors, or whatever may be their task. They are a fine group of men doing important work for the country at comparatively modest salaries. In these difficult times they are confronted with all sorts of difficulties, to some of which the gentleman from New York has referred.

In addition, it is also true that they are subject to frequent transfers, interfering with their home life. They do not know how long they will live in a certain place. Every time they are transferred, necessarily substantial expense is involved in moving. Most of them have families who are

subjected to this inconvenience at any season of the year. They accept these instructions graciously as part of their job.

One of the worst features of this forced additional 30-day furlough to which they have been recently subjected is that it can not help but tend to destroy the morale of the force as a whole. Perhaps all of you do not realize that alongside the immigration organization, with its patrolmen and inspectors, there is generally a customhouse, with its inspectors and employees, all employed by the same Government. Living there in the same town, under the same general conditions, drawing just as good, if not better, salaries, the customs inspectors, employees of the Treasury Department, have not been subjected to this administrative furlough in addition to the legislative furlough.

If you were in the position of one of these immigration inspectors or patrolmen, you could realize how unfair that discrimination would appear to you.

If that were a discrimination which had been brought about through carefully considered legislation, a discrimination that had been intentional, based upon some justification in fact, I would not be here complaining. But, as has already been brought out in the colloquies which have transpired during the last 10 minutes, that discrimination was not foreseen when the supply bills were passed, were not in accordance with any congressional intent, but resulted from an arbitrary, ill-advised percentage cut made with reference to the appropriation for this particular department after the general appropriation bill passed this House. There is no doubt of that. Whether some one may say it would not have occurred if we had cut the salaries as recommended by the Economy Committee, I do not know, and it is beside the point. That, however, can not be true, for these employees receive a salary of about \$2,000 a year on the average. If the recommendation of the Economy Committee had been accepted, 11 per cent on that portion of the salary above \$1,000, their cut would have been about \$110, while the cut under the administrative-furlough provision amounts to 8½ per cent, or one-twelfth of their present salary, a cut of about \$167. Dismissals or furloughs would have been more drastic under the other plan. This furlough that they are given under the act, one month's vacation without pay, can not be taken in one month in this service as administered. The furlough is applied to each and every week. They must be on the job—that is, they have to remain there locally. They work five days a week, and therefore do not accumulate a period of a week or two weeks or a month for any vacation that can be taken without pay.

There is, therefore, an unjustified discrimination between two departments whose employees work almost side by side, and one which can not help but break down the morale of the service and thus seriously affect the wonderful work that the Bureau of Immigration has been doing.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. This discrimination comes especially because the other departments did not have this direct perpendicular 10 per cent cut.

Mr. BURTNESS. Of course, some of the other departments did have such a cut, but the department alongside of which these men work did not suffer from it, and it was never intended by Congress that these men should be thrown out of employment for more than one month during the year. Some of them were confronted a few weeks ago with an order requiring them to discontinue work for six months, which could not be set aside until a tremendous amount of pressure was brought to bear against it.

If I had the time, I feel I could show you that it is not economy in the long run to furlough these men. In fact, it will mean additional expense in the future to round up and deport undesirable aliens who will come in while these officers are taking their enforced leave. The amendment should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment there is both merit and justice in the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Immigration, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]. I contend there is even economy in it. If the Members knew the Mexican border as I know it, they would say the same thing. To begin with, this is the rankest kind of discrimination, as provided in the original bill, against a class of men who are rendering as fine service for as little money as any class of men in the Government service. In the second place, I believe the Government would have to spend more money on the aliens who come to this country in supporting them for a while and then deporting them than would be spent in keeping up this splendid service.

For many years I have had personal and official relations with many of these men who work along the Mexican border. After the revolutions a few years ago in Mexico aliens by the thousands came into this country. May I remind you that along that meandering Rio Grande from El Paso to Brownsville there is a distance of approximately a thousand miles.

Since the Government built the Elephant Butte Dam the Rio Grande near El Paso can be forded at most any season of the year. The result in my own little city was that our schools were literally jammed and packed with Mexican children, many of them children of immigrants from Mexico. Not only that, but our hospitals were filled to where we could not take care of them, and, still worse, our court dockets were crowded with Mexicans who had landed in jail for criminal offenses.

Then came the border patrol. They rode up and down that border for several hundred miles, most of them on horseback. They subjected themselves to danger every day, and within the last year several of them have lost their lives. They are a fine, honest, patriotic, law-abiding class of men who are enforcing the immigration laws of this country. They have rendered a distinct service to the cause of Americanism. Why single them out and say that the clerk in the Treasury Department in Washington or the clerk in the post office in San Francisco will only take his 30 days' furlough, but those men riding that long Mexican border keeping out the Chinese referred to by the chairman, and about which I know something personally, keeping out Mexicans by the thousands, when we can not provide employment for our own people, shall take a two to six months' furlough without pay? We can not take care of the unemployment situation among our own people. If there ever was a time in the history of our country when we ought to see America and patronize America and employ Americans, it is now. There never was as good reason for strict enforcement of our immigration laws as now.

Take away the border patrol along the Mexican border from San Diego, Calif., along the Arizona and New Mexico line, from El Paso to Brownsville, a distance of about 2,100 miles—take those men off another month in addition to the month furlough they must take now without pay, and within less than six months thousands of Mexicans and other aliens will come across that border and be a charge on the charity of our people, violate our laws, and put our taxpayers to additional expense. There is no economy in it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom I try to increase an item in an appropriation bill, but I am doing so at this time for economy's sake. I maintain that it is a great deal cheaper to keep these aliens out than it is to go through all the various steps necessary to deport them after they get in; and I defy anybody to refute this statement.

As I understand, in the next appropriation bill for the Labor Department they are going to ask for some \$600,000 additional for the purpose of deportation. On the other hand, if things have come to such a pass that we are willing to give every man in every department of the Gov-

ernment an additional 30 days' furlough I am perfectly willing that it should be applied to immigration officers, but it is absolutely unfair, and no one has ever said a word to justify it, to ask these men to take an additional furlough, that no other man in the employ of the Government is asked to take at the present time.

Furthermore, with the restricted immigration that we are trying to put into effect at the present time there is a great deal more incentive for these aliens to try to get into this country than there was in normal times, and for this reason alone we should not in any way do anything that will decrease the force along the borders that are keeping these undesirable people out.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman from New York tell the House how the immigration law is going to be enforced during the period of time these men are on the six months' furlough?

Mr. SNELL. They certainly can not be, but I want to be fair about it. They are only going to give these men an additional 30 to 60 days' furlough under a new order. This was all brought about by that perpendicular cut of 10 per cent that came in the consideration of some of these appropriation bills which did not apply to all of them. In the interest of absolute economy and the absolute carrying out of the will of Congress in connection with immigration laws we should increase this appropriation and keep these men at work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we have a display of the border force coming in to make a raid on the Treasury to the extent of \$600,000.

The appropriation as carried in the existing appropriation law is \$9,450,000; for this same service the same amount that was carried in the preceding fiscal year, and the same amount in both years for expenditure in the District of Columbia.

Listening to these advocates coming from the border who may have some of these specially anointed officials in their districts, you would think that they are underpaid. These men are in the classified service, receiving the highest pay for this character of work of any men in the Government. They receive from \$2,100 to a maximum of \$3,000. They are promoted every year, promoted not to the extent of \$100 at a time but to the extent of \$200 at a time until they reach a maximum of \$3,000. Yet when you hear the chairman of the Committee on Labor and these other advocates, you would think they were the poorest paid men in the Government service.

As a matter of administration, Secretary Doak has taken some of the men from that service and maybe has reduced the number of hours of employment, but the testimony showed that every one of these men are employed four days a week. Does not the gentleman from Massachusetts and these other advocates of these men think that a man with a basic salary of \$3,000 is now very fortunate indeed if he has four days' work a week regular employment? These are times for economy. Fractional economy is not sufficient.

Every man in this House went before the people advocating economy, and now you are expected to load down the Treasury to the extent of \$600,000. For whom? For the benefit of some specially favored employees that happen to be along the border. I am acquainted with some of these men, so far as Windsor and Detroit are concerned. They are not starving and they are not underpaid. They are the best paid men in the Government service, and I say if there was ever an occasion when we should adhere to economy and not give heed to the border advocates of some specially appointed class, it is now.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. I have no argument about the wages that are paid to these people, but will the gentleman give me one reason why these people should be laid off 60 or 90 days, as against other departments of the Government?

Mr. STAFFORD. In private employment there are any number of men who are being laid off who were only getting starvation wages. These men are getting wages of \$3,000 a year, and all that is proposed here is to cut down their employment from six days to four days a week. I am surprised at the gentleman's advocating this extravagant appropriation.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for the beautiful tributes which he paid to me in reference to economy and about my not wanting to see the wages of Government employees cut. I do not want to see their wages cut, any of them; and after a while perhaps even the gentleman from Wisconsin will realize, as well as private industry following out the principles of the Government, that you can not buy clothing if you have not the money, and you can not buy anything if your wages are cut to the extent that everyone is going to be laid off and everyone is going to be unemployed.

In reference to the matter now before the House, I do not see any justice in penalizing these employees of the immigration border patrol or of the Immigration Service when none of the other Government employees are to be penalized in the same manner. In the case of some of the members of the Immigration Service, after they have worked for years and years they get paid the stupendous sum of \$3,000 to support their families. When they reach this amount they get four days a week or five days a week, and the gentleman from Wisconsin did not tell you that they work many, many hours overtime and get not one cent for it. Their work is also difficult and requires tact and courage, and the lone rider who is riding along the hundreds of miles of the Texas-Mexico border has to have courage, grit, tact, ability, and endurance, and believe me, he earns his \$3,000 after he has been waiting years to get it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from Wisconsin did not tell why they were penalized more than employees of other departments.

Mr. CONNERY. No; the gentleman from Wisconsin did not give any answer to why they were penalized in comparison with other employees.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, because there is no other service in the Government except the Customs Service where a majority in the service are receiving wages as high as \$3,000.

Mr. CONNERY. That is no reason for penalizing them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman think a man who is getting \$2,500 or \$3,000 in these times of stress is penalized in comparison with men in private employment?

Mr. CONNERY. Did the gentleman ever try to raise a family of five children on \$2,500 a year? If not, let him try it and see how far he can get.

Mr. STAFFORD. These men are not raising families of five children. They are raising other things besides children.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for the current year is \$9,400,000 for the Immigration Service. This provides for 3,700 employees, an increase from the year 1926 of from 2,400 to 3,700. This is an average increase of more than 10 per cent per year in the field and in the District of Columbia.

The provisions of the law as they stand now simply require an additional 30-day furlough and this can be endured by this bloc of employees better than by some others because there has been this large increase in the number of employees over a period of six years. This is the reason we probably can furlough these men 30 days better than we can furlough some of the employees in some of the other departments, where there has not been such an increase in the last three years.

It seems to me if we are ever going to stop appropriating money, we must stop by refusing to increase the Budget, and here is an opportunity for those who want to economize to say no.

The department itself only asked for \$20,000 of extra money to take care of the departmental service in their statement before the committee, and the committee gave them this by increasing the amount that could be taken from the field service, and the suggested amendment proposes to give them \$50,000 extra, \$30,000 more than the department asked.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. While these men are on furlough, will the service be maintained?

Mr. TABER. Why, yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. If we permit men to be smuggled across the border, will it not cost more to get rid of them afterwards than the original cost?

Mr. TABER. I do not doubt that the service will be maintained right along and will be well maintained. There has been such a steady increase, approximately 10 per cent a year, over six years, that I believe there will be plenty to carry on the service with the money already appropriated.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to correct the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that the immigration border patrolmen on the Detroit front who were given this six months' furlough were not suffering.

Practically all of these men were in financial distress when they were laid off, and after a few weeks they were in greater distress. Just across the border in Canada are at least 100,000 aliens trying to come across and enter the United States. If they do get in, they are very apt to take a job from some American, particularly in our city.

There are many thousands in the city of Detroit alone who have to depend upon public and private welfare organizations. This money would be well expended by keeping out aliens.

Once they enter, money must be expended to deport them to their native lands. For other reasons they are a burden of expense to the American people. I urge the House to adopt the Dickstein amendment.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE] asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if the Immigration Service could be maintained with the present furlough plan in force, to which the gentleman from New York replied that it could. I say that it can not. I have a peculiar situation along the border of my district as it will be, because in the 100 miles, we have 57 traveled roads aside from a lot of byroads. Some of our posts are 1-man posts. The immigration Service along our border is greatly undermanned, so that with normal conditions it is only possible to give two-thirds time for a man at these 1-man posts, while with this furlough plan in operation it will be possible to guard the road only one-third of the time. So manifestly along that border it will not be possible to efficiently maintain the service as stated by the gentleman from New York.

So far as the economy feature is concerned, with the avenues of immigration unguarded so many will come in without right that when we come to deport them it will cost the Government \$10 for every dollar saved out of salaries.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I think the situation with reference to this item emphasizes the folly of the reduction of blanket appropriations without careful study in each particular case.

Now, in the regular appropriation bill there was a flat reduction of a lump-sum appropriation which is used for the purpose of deportation. This appropriation included not only salaries but all expenses incidental to deportations of aliens. Out of 16,631 aliens who were deported in 1930—and I am only giving these figures to show the ratio, which I believe would be about the same for the current fiscal year—13,842 were deported at the expense of the Government. Of the 13,842 deported at the expense of the Government 1,476 were deported by vessels. That item alone is over \$75,000. In addition there is railroad fare and maintenance for all 13,842 aliens deported at Government expense. There is

where the larger portion of the expense comes in, and an arbitrary reduction of the lump-sum appropriation now necessitates this unreasonable furloughing of the employees in order to meet the funds on hand. Surely the employees should not be penalized by an additional 30 or 60 day furlough without pay. But, aside from that, this plan will cost the Government a great deal more than the expected savings.

Now, that brings up the question of policy. If the Congress intends that the department should continue the work of deportation of aliens in penal institutions and all aliens who are here in violation of law or who are otherwise amenable to deportation, then this money must be appropriated. Failure to do so will not only prevent the proper enforcement of the law and change the entire policy established by Congress but will be more costly to the Government.

As I stated before, in times of rigid enforcement the immigration law, as brought about by Executive order, has increased the incentive for alien smuggling, and surreptitious entry is greater. At this time there is systematized smuggling of aliens over the border and by steamship at the port. I have repeatedly stated, and I now say, that from my experience in the Consular Service and in the Immigration Service aliens can not be brought into the country without the knowledge if not the connivance of the steamship companies.

The law provides heavy penalties for every alien unlawfully brought into the country. The steamship companies have been able to evade these penalties. Either the fine is not imposed or, if so, invariably the fine is abated. Why the Government should be generous to the steamship companies violating the law is more than I can understand. I invite an investigation of aliens unlawfully brought into this country where the steamship has been ascertained and no fines imposed, and I also invite a scrutiny of the long list of fines abated that have been imposed. Why the Government should be so generous with these law-violating companies is more than I can understand. I want to say, however, that this system of abating and rescinding fines has been going on for many, many years. Yet while generous in the matter of fines, we find a most parsimonious attitude in the treatment of the employees intrusted with the enforcement of the law.

Now, let us look at the situation. There is no saving here. It will cost the Government more than the \$600,000 the amendment calls for. Aside from the manifest injustice to this service, as pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], of compelling these employees to take 60 or 90 days furlough without pay while employees of other departments are furloughed only 30 days, it must be remembered that this is comparatively a small service and that the extended and prolonged furloughs will necessarily retard and hamper the work. What we save in this unfair and unjust reduction of appropriations, the Government will spend in feeding, housing, and caring for the aliens. As I have pointed out, a large percentage of the aliens are deported at Government expense. That means, gentlemen, that from the time the alien is taken into custody, whether on a warrant of arrest off the streets or from a penal or other institution, until he is landed in the foreign port it is all at the expense of the Government. It is simple mathematics that if the work is retarded, the procedure of deportation in each case will be prolonged, entailing additional expense to the Government.

These men are not overpaid. I know it. And I speak from actual knowledge. As my colleagues know, I served in the Immigration Service. It is difficult work, specialized work, and requires training and experience. Some of the men who are to be penalized to this fallacious policy served with me 25 years ago and are still in the service. If anything at all, considering the nature of the work, the responsibility, these men are underpaid. It has been said on the floor to-day that the officials of the department, the heads of the department, have not asked for this additional appropriation. I do know that Secretary Doak told me that the service would be greatly impaired unless the deficiency bill

did provide additional funds. Commissioner Corsi, at Ellis Island, also told me that he did not know how he could not only meet the requirements of the service but properly and safely man and operate the immigration station at Ellis Island with this additional reduction. Therefore, as a matter of public interest, I feel that it is absolutely necessary to provide the additional funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I can well understand how these gentlemen who represent districts on the border should appear here and insist on this appropriation. These persons employed under this appropriation are employed on our borders.

We have heard a good deal about economy. I was very much disappointed when this House the other day made a most unwarranted appropriation out of the Public Treasury for a central heating plant at Howard University, which was not asked for by the President and the Director of the Budget. There never was an appropriation, in my opinion, for which as little could be said under the circumstances, when we are confronted with a deficit next June of over \$1,600,000,000.

I stand here and plead for economy, and you gentlemen are in favor of economy. But what is the use, gentlemen, when your own President and Director of the Budget tell you that an appropriation is not necessary, and then we come here on the floor of the House and because of a few distinguished gentlemen—and I am not criticizing them—who come from sections of the country where pressure is great, vote for that appropriation because they ask it. Why should you, contrary to the recommendation of the President and the Director of the Budget, appropriate \$600,000 out of the Public Treasury?

Oh, they say, it will cause somebody to be furloughed. I regret to see that very much, but we are not making fish of one and fowl of the other when we do that, according to the Secretary of Labor. But I do say this. Your Committee on Appropriations is doing its level best to save money. Your Committee on Appropriations is doing its level best to balance the Budget by reducing expenditures. There is not a member of that committee on either side who is not exerting himself in that direction. For God's sake give us some encouragement, and when we bring out an appropriation, do not go ahead and add to the expenditures of the Treasury by adding something that has not been recommended. We have done no more than we thought is right in these premises. People are losing their jobs, I know. Oh yes, there are lots of people who are losing their jobs down in my town, not for 30 days, but for months.

Only a moment ago we passed an appropriation of \$625,000 to take care of the jobless and the unemployed here in the District of Columbia, and here we are told that it is perfectly monstrous because perhaps somebody is going to get two or three weeks further furlough out of his salary. I do not like to see people furloughed. Neither do you. I have no more interest in this matter, and I claim no more interest in it, and I claim to have no more zeal and no more earnestness in the matter than you have, because you all want to economize, but, as one distinguished gentleman once said, there is but one way to reduce, and that is to reduce, and I hope you will do it in this case.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, let me say in the beginning that I shall not take issue with the chairman of the legislative committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], as to the correctness of the facts he recites as to furloughs being necessary unless this appropriation is increased. I disagree, however, with him as to the wisdom of increasing this appropriation, and there are some facts that should be emphasized in connection with the very splendid statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. The President and the Secretary of Labor have not, and will not, recommend an increase for personnel pay, I understand. I want to commend the action of the President and the Secretary of Labor in not asking any deficiency appropriation for the salaries of employees even in this important service, and the

House should know that furloughs in many other bureaus have been ordered and taken. This bureau is not an exception, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] seems to think.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] called attention to the large number of increases made in the personnel of this service. Take the Immigration Service proper. That has been increased since 1926 by 723. Then the border patrol was established in 1925 with a personnel of 655, and this personnel was increased to 983 by 1932. All of these increases are for the Immigration Service. Now, what of the appropriations for this service? How rapidly that has grown. Going back to 1923 we appropriated for this service \$3,960,988. Take the year 1926, the year to which reference has been made, after the organization of a border patrol in 1925. In that year \$5,826,857 was appropriated. But what of 1932? The appropriation that year amounted to \$10,823,943. Congress approved a substantial cut in the 1933 appropriation under what had been carried for 1932, and there was not a Member of the House who did not boast of the fact that Congress had made large reductions in 1933 under what was carried in 1932. No Member will rise now and say that he declared to his constituency that an injustice had been done the Immigration Service by the cut made in the 1932 appropriation. Candidates for President, for Congress, for the Senate, all were proud to claim credit for the cuts that had been made, and yet the people rightly insisted that further reductions must and should be made. No agency of the Government should be exempt.

If you want to deport more with a smaller force than you now have, you can do so by providing additional funds for deportations. Two millions will deport about 20,000 aliens. Provide the funds, and notwithstanding the administrative furloughs now sought to be avoided, you can largely, with the same personnel, increase your departs by the thousands. Eleemosynary institutions are furnishing information as to those unlawfully here. Jails are supplying that information, civic organizations, on whom these aliens are now a charge, are furnishing the information. There is no longer the need for a large personnel to go out and seek in hiding places aliens unlawfully here. What is needed is for the Legislative Committee to favorably act on recommendations repeatedly made by administrative officials to strengthen the hands of the law. Let the Secretary of Labor be clothed with a discretion to delegate to field officers in the Immigration Service the right to issue warrants, and you will save time and subsistence expense incident to deportations. That recommendation has been pending before the Legislative Committee for a long time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Let the legislative committee forbid the admission of skilled agriculturists, and you will thereby stop the flow of many that should no longer be allowed to come. Then let the legislative committee do what every civilized country of the world has done and what our people will give hearty approval to, namely, require general registration of all aliens within a limited time, lawfully entitled to be here, and you will dispense with all of this spy hunting. Attention is called by those favoring an increased appropriation to the fact that aliens unlawfully here are employed in large numbers, and thus denying employment to our own citizens. If you will require registration of all aliens entitled to be here, and place a heavy penalty on those who employ aliens, unable to produce a registration certificate, then you will have largely solved the whole problem of deportations, and with a well-paid personnel selected from your present large and efficient force you can enforce your immigration laws effectively and with a largely reduced appropriation.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Not just now. A little later I will gladly yield, if time allows.

Now, what are the facts? Again I want to commend the State Department for its interpretation of acts passed in previous years when all consuls were instructed, "To honor

no application to enter the United States, even though within the quota authorization unless satisfactory proof can be offered that the applicant has sufficient funds for his support, and is not likely to become a public charge."

What has been the result? This year those lawfully entering have been cut to a minimum number. Only 35,000 have been admitted, and for the last year and a half, as we are advised by Mr. Hull, the Commissioner of Immigration, there have left our shores voluntarily, without expense to the Government, more than a million aliens. When he made this statement, I said to him, "If economic conditions and other influences silently, yet effectively at work, have caused more than a million aliens to leave without expense, why go before the American people now and say, 'Increase our appropriations to maintain a large personnel to deport 20,000 or 25,000 annually, at an ever-increasing cost to the Government.'"

The President is right, and the Secretary is right in courageously saying to the Appropriations Committee and to the public, "These requests for increased funds should be turned down." We now have largely stopped the inflow of those heretofore lawfully allowed to enter, and economic conditions are forcing many to leave without any expense whatever to the Government. The unemployment situation is now stimulating the States, within the limits of the Constitution, to pass laws to do what the legislative Committee on Immigration has thus far failed to do. Massachusetts is now considering passing a law which it is claimed is constitutional and which will require the registration of all entitled to claim American citizenship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, after listening to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], on the subject of immigration, I think the gentleman knows less about it than I know about appropriations made by the gentleman's committee. The gentleman wants to empower an ordinary immigration inspector as judge and jury, to issue warrants wherever he goes, and lock up anybody he wants to. If we do that there is not enough money in the Public Treasury to support that appropriation. I submit the gentleman's proposition is wrong. Power can not be vested in an agent to issue warrants and lock up anybody he wants to.

I wish to read an article appearing in yesterday's New York World-Telegram, which comments about practices which might grow if an immigration inspector should be empowered to act as judge and jury and issue warrants wherever he may go:

[World-Telegram, January 3, 1933]

AN OFFICIAL RACKET

In Los Angeles the so-called "red squad" has been arresting radicals on "suspicion of criminal syndicalism." There is no such charge under California law, so the police hold the victims in jail for a while and then dismiss them.

In New York United States customs officials seized a consignment of Russian posters belonging to Corliss Lamont. The posters were held for four months on suspicion of containing "seditious sentiments," then released.

In Buffalo immigration men arrested and held for two to six weeks 38 suspected aliens. They made the arrests without the formality of warrants and denied the victims counsel. One Italian girl was held seven months before she obtained a lawyer, who promptly secured her deliverance.

These are scattered examples of a type of tyranny being practiced with increasing frequency by lazy and brutal officials of the law. The purpose is intimidation of minorities. When legal justification is lacking these officials reach beyond the law and arrest on suspicion or use some fantastic charge they know will not stick in the courts. The victims are released but not before they have been branded as law violators and their cases well aired in the newspapers.

This is a racket. It is more dangerous than the many practiced by underworld racketeers, for it is done under the law and has the law's apparent sanction.

The Wickersham Commission said of such tactics, "It is a fundamental principle of the common law that a citizen may not lawfully be imprisoned by a policeman or any other official merely because the official thinks such action to be for the public good."

I have received many letters expressing opposition to the principle of our immigration law referred to in this article.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were ayes 70 and noes 64.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. BYRNS and Mr. DICKSTEIN as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 80 and noes 73.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for the Employment Service, including the same objects and under the same limitations specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1933, \$200,000.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLGOOD: Page 7, line 12, strike out from line 12 to and including line 17.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment refers to the employment service, which is asking for an additional deficiency appropriation of \$200,000. Of course, I am subjecting myself to severe criticism again in opposing appropriations of this character. Somebody will say at once, "Oh, we have to take care of the unemployed in this country. Here we are striking out an appropriation that seeks to give men employment, that seeks to help men to get jobs."

There is carried in the regular appropriation bill \$735,000 and the hearings show that those in charge of this activity deliberately established additional offices, which increased this appropriation, and they did it at the instance of Members of Congress. It was political. A campaign was on. Members of Congress wanted to make political capital out of the fact that they were getting employment agencies established in certain towns and cities in their districts. I quote from the hearings:

Congressmen and Senators have asked us to establish offices here and there, and we have tried to accommodate them as best we could. That is what we propose to do here.

My colleagues, the campaign is over. The election has been held. The Red Cross in the towns, cities, and States is performing this service throughout the Nation. The American Legion has found jobs for a million men. Practically every other man on the street on which I live in Gadsden, Ala., is out of a job. If there were such a thing as a job to be had in that city, there would be a thousand people ready to take it. It is not a question of finding men to take jobs, but it is a question of finding jobs for the men. That is the problem we are up against in this country. Here we are continuing to raid the Treasury for appropriations that are not getting results.

I have shown there are other agencies that are helping these people who are out of employment find employment wherever it can be done. Absolutely, there are enough agencies, local, State, city, and national, to help the people that are unemployed if you can find jobs. The question is to find jobs.

Our national deficit is running about \$7,000,000 a day and we are adding to it with these needless appropriations, just one appropriation after another.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McMILLAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The report shows that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], who is on this committee, is opposed to this appropriation. I recall that he fought it last year with all the ardor that he possessed. He realizes that under the conditions existing to-day you can appropriate all the money you want for the purpose of helping men find jobs, but unless there are jobs they can not be

found. The only people who are benefited by this appropriation are the 135 people who are in these employment agencies holding the jobs.

Several men from my town went down to Birmingham where the agency in Alabama is located, to see if the employment bureau could help them get work; any kind of work. They registered and tried to get this agency to secure them positions, but they did not get jobs for any one of them. The men never heard from the agency. They went down there, registered their names, gave their post office and street addresses, and that was all there was to it.

As I say, it is political. The campaign is over. Here is a place where we can reduce and cut off \$200,000. That leaves \$735,000 under the appropriation and leaves one of these agencies in every State of the Union. They have doubled up in some places, for instance, in Kansas, St. Louis, and some other places in Missouri they have three agencies in each of those cities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily and entirely disagree with the position taken by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD]. He says this appropriation is a political appropriation made for the purpose of holding men in their jobs. I think he is in error. At any rate, he is in error so far as my experience in Massachusetts is concerned.

These offices have been in operation in various sections of the country. It was an emergency appropriation originally to relieve unemployment and distress, and so far as my experience goes it has been entirely satisfactory to the people in our section.

The department stated that unless this deficiency appropriation was made at this time, 30 of these employment offices throughout the country would be closed as of January 1.

The section of the country from which the gentleman from Alabama comes does not suffer the rigors and hardships of a New England winter, but if there ever is a time when we in New England ought to endeavor to keep our people employed it is from the 1st of January. I think there are three positions involved so far as the employment offices to which I refer are concerned. What are the positions? They are not political, as the gentleman says; they are of no value whatsoever from any political standpoint, but they are of value in providing an opportunity for those out of employment to secure some sort of work that will keep body and soul together in the cold winter climate of New England.

The 1st of January is the very worst time throughout the entire year that those offices could be closed. This \$200,000 is only for a temporary purpose. It is to keep those 30 offices going from now until the 1st of July. By that time there is opportunity for employment such as does not exist in winter, and I have had requests to assist in securing this additional appropriation from men who never seek political favor, men who have no connection whatsoever with politics, men who stand for something in the community, and who realize what work has been done by these offices in the way of securing employment for people in conjunction with the usual employment offices maintained by States and the humanitarian organizations in the vicinity. These people are not appealing to me for this assistance from the political angle. They are appealing to me from the humanitarian standpoint—that the Government should show its interest in keeping people employed in New England during the severe and strenuous winter season. Therefore, I appeal to this House to accept the recommendations of the committee in asking for this additional \$200,000 that the 30 offices that would be closed

immediately should this appropriation fail to be continued until July 1.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The gentleman spoke about the humanitarian standpoint as well as opportunity. Last year when we had up the appropriation to take care of the poor throughout the country—

Mr. TREADWAY. Is the gentleman going to ask me a question or make a speech?

Mr. ALLGOOD. No; I am not going to make a speech.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then get to the question.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The gentleman opposed that appropriation and said it was a dole. If we take care of the poor of the country, it is a dole.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman has not yet asked me a question. I still say it is for the humanitarian interest and welfare of the people that this appropriation be retained.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on page 99 of the hearings Mr. Alpine, who is the director of the Employment Service, said:

From April 1, 1931, to November 1, 1932, this reorganized service found jobs for 1,842,055 people, or an average of 102,336 per month.

I am not going to say what I know of the experience of the employment offices in New York or in Missouri or in California, but I do know practically what they have done in Massachusetts. I know that these employment officers of the Federal employment offices not only conducted their offices in rent-free quarters, which they got from the different cities, but they went out into the factories and into the mills and into the offices and the stores of the cities in which they were situated and contacted jobs for the unemployed. They made contacts with the State authorities on State work and arranged plans whereby a married man with dependents would get first choice on these jobs.

This appropriation, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has said, is to keep 30 offices opened until July 1. We are now in the worst part of the year, beginning with January 1, when there is the most unemployment, because there are no seasonal occupations and when the people are really suffering the worst privation and hunger.

In addition to this, you must realize that they have already closed, regardless of this appropriation, a certain number of offices which they could not keep up until the present time. This will merely allow them to keep open these 30 offices until the 1st of July.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. DYER. What the gentleman says as to Boston and Massachusetts is likewise true of St. Louis and Missouri. They have found a number of places by going to the factories and mills and getting them to put on an extra man here and there.

Mr. CONNERY. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri and I believe this would be economy if it were only for the purpose of starting a system to show how you can put people to work even when they say there are no jobs.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is in these times of unemployment that private employment agencies and the crimps do most of their exploitation. Men are desperate for work and pay a fee under promise of employment only to be deceived. This is going on at this time. A national system of employment, as well as a State system, will eventually do away with this terrible exploitation that has been going on for years.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman has brought out a very important point, because when they go to a Federal employment agency they know they are not going to deal with a lot of grafters, but will be dealing with the United States Government and this gives them new faith and confidence in their own Government.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD], the new economy expert of the House, a few moments ago took the floor and enunciated the principle and policy of being opposed to the Government taking care of the suffering and starving, and now he is opposed to the Government lending its hand to find employment for those who are suffering and starving and who want to find work in these days of unemployment.

I was rather surprised to hear from the lips of the gentleman from Alabama an indictment of his Democratic Party and its leaders in the last session. When he accused the Congress of passing these Employment Service appropriations for political purposes he accused the Democratic Party of squandering the taxpayers' money to advance the political purposes of that party, because the Democratic Party has been in control of the House during the last session of Congress when the appropriations about which he complains were made. I am surprised that a gentleman from Alabama on the Democratic side would stand up on the floor of the House and indict his own party and thus indict the Democratic chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the Democratic majority on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two minutes in order to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Some time ago the Secretary of Labor gave notice of the discontinuance of a number of these offices and of a reduction of the personnel in others. I would like to know if this \$200,000 will provide for the continuance of the offices that he had in mind at that time.

Mr. BYRNS. It is my understanding it will take care of all of them until July 1.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will it include the uptown New York office?

Mr. BYRNS. It is my understanding it will include all of the offices to which my colleague from Tennessee refers.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I would also like to know whether they have been continued in anticipation of this action by the Congress.

Mr. BYRNS. It is my understanding they will be reopened.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Are any of them discontinued at this time?

Mr. BYRNS. I am told that 11 offices have been closed, but this \$200,000, we were told, would enable the department to take care of all the offices until July 1.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I have had occasion to observe the work of this service during the past summer and I think they are doing an excellent work, and I wish to commend the committee for including this item in the appropriation bill. I think, Mr. Chairman, that instead of contracting this employment activity it might very well be expanded.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that my direct observations of the working of this law is entirely in the interest of the men out of jobs in this country and the most important thing that Congress has before it is providing jobs for the unemployed. Doing away with this kind of work would, in my judgment, betray the very interests we are trying hardest to serve.

The truth of the matter is we have got to give jobs and not sums of money. This House, this Congress, at the last session passed this law. This House and this Congress at the second session has to maintain that law. I am glad to see that only one man, only one Member, has arisen in favor of this amendment, and I hope the vote will be in accord with that number, because this is for the interest of the men who work and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts says, not for politics in any State or county. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Claims for damages by collision with naval vessels: To pay claims for damages adjusted and determined by the Secretary of the Navy under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels," approved December 28, 1922 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 599), as fully set forth in House Document No. 503, Seventy-second Congress, \$615.09.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, after line 4, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Selections under the act of June 10, 1926, shall be construed as selections under the law existing June 10, 1922."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede that the amendment is subject to a point of order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill; but I want to call attention to the merits of the amendment, and then I trust that the gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his point of order.

The object of the amendment is to clarify a ruling by the comptroller. In 1922 the House passed a pay bill. In 1926 the Congress passed an equalization bill seeking to equalize the pay of the officers of the line in the staff and the Navy. The officers got their pay under the act of 1926, and it has been running that way up to last October, when the comptroller in construing the act deducted \$75 a month from the doctors' salaries, and among them the salary of the House physician. It was never the intention of Congress when it passed the equalization act of 1926, the Britten bill, that the comptroller would so construe it.

This amendment is merely to correct that injustice. Each officer had his salary reduced 8.3 per cent, but in addition thereto they have made a further reduction of \$75 per month from their salaries. The comptroller in his ruling did not require the officer to pay back into the Treasury anything received in the past, but in the future he held that there should be a reduction of \$75 a month.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. I wish the gentleman would make clear to the House the fact that these officers in the Medical Corps have been drawing a specific salary for six years, and, under the comptroller's decision, he may determine to ask for a refund of that which they have been drawing.

This amendment of the gentleman will not increase any salaries. It will not entail any additional appropriations. It will merely allow these officers in the Medical Corps to get for the month of October, 1932, on, just exactly what Congress intended they should have.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And what the Congress has appropriated.

Mr. BRITTEN. And what the Congress has appropriated for them. The language is clarifying. It is legislation, of course, on an appropriation bill, but I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will not insist on the point of order, because if he does, we are likely to find our House physician and twenty-odd others called upon by the Comptroller of the Currency to refund several thousand dollars that has been paid to them during the past six years by the Paymaster General of the Navy, under the opinion of the Solicitor of the Navy Department, that that is what these men were entitled to, and that is what the Congress intended they should have. Certainly there is no one on the floor of the House who wants a rebate from these men.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman realizes that we should not legislate on an appropriation bill. This would not only affect one man but 34 others. It not only affects the naval service but the Army may be affected. The matter should come through in the regular course. No

hearings have been had upon the proposal. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first word. I have taken occasion from time to time to take exception to the Democratic leadership in control of this House for its failure to balance the Budget of this country. Balancing the Budget requires, of course, reducing expenses and also increasing revenues. However, the remarks that I am going to make now are going to be directed primarily to my Republican brethren, and it is going to be my criticism of members of my party sitting here in this House who within the last week have voted for over \$1,000,000 of appropriations which our own President and our own Budget Director have turned down. We can not stand before our country or before our President and do that sort of thing. Our position is indefensible. It is not only indefensible politically, but it is indefensible to our country at a time when expenses must be reduced. There is no excuse for it. Within the last few minutes I have seen a gentleman of the Tammany delegation stand here and ask for an increase of \$606,000 in this bill which our own Budget Director turned down and which our own President did not send to Congress, and yet it was passed, primarily by a coalition of Tammany votes and Republican votes. But my greatest criticism is against the Republicans, because Tammany is consistent. It is always a Treasury raider and makes no other profession, while my party makes the profession of economy. I want it to be consistent. I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. BYRNS] will insist upon a separate vote in the House upon this amendment, so that this addition may be stricken from the bill, and I appeal to every one of my Republican colleagues in the name of economy, in the hope of balancing the Budget of our country, to play the game squarely and uphold at least the hands of our own administration and our own President and Budget Director.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGUGIN. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I believe the gentleman and I voted against that \$606,000 appropriation. I know I did. Will the gentleman be kind enough to lay greater emphasis on the fact that this is a Democratic Congress and a Democratic House, and that that expenditure was voted by Democrats and not necessarily by Republicans?

Mr. MCGUGIN. No. I watched the tellers here, and if the Republicans had not gone through the tellers the amendment would not have started to pass. It was a coalition of Tammany Democrats and Republicans. I know there are extravagant Democrats on the Democratic side of the aisle who never pay any attention to their leadership, and for them I have no brief.

Mr. HASTINGS. Let me assure the gentleman from Kansas that a request will be made for a separate vote upon this item, and we hope the gentleman's remarks will bear good fruit on his side of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany: For an additional amount for expenses of determining the amounts of claims against Germany by the Mixed Claims Commission established under the agreement concluded between the United States and Germany on August 10, 1922, and subsequent agreement between those Governments, for the determination of the amount to be paid by Germany in satisfaction of the financial obligations of Germany under the treaty concluded between the Governments of the United States and Germany on August 25, 1921, including the expenses which under the terms of such agreement of August 10, 1922, are chargeable in part to the United States, and the preparation of a final report by the American commissioner and the orderly arrangement for preservation and disposition of the records of the commission; and the expenses of an agency of the United States to perform all necessary services in connection with the preparation of claims and the presentation thereof before said Mixed Claims Commission, and the preparation of a final report of the agent and the orderly arrangement for preservation of the records of the agency and the disposition of property jointly owned by the two Governments, including salaries of an agent and neces-

sary counsel and other assistants and employees, rent in the District of Columbia, employment of special counsel, translators, and other technical experts, by contract, without regard to the provisions of any statute relative to employment, and for contract stenographic reporting services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), law books and books of reference, printing and binding, contingent expenses, traveling expenses, press-clipping service, and such other expenses in the United States and elsewhere as the President may deem proper, fiscal year 1933, \$40,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation made for this commission for the fiscal years 1932 and 1933 by the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1932, shall be available for payments heretofore or hereafter made for press-clipping service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. The purpose is to inquire whether there has been any change in existing law as to extending the scope of the Mixed Claims Commission.

Mr. BYRNS. No; there has not been.

Mr. STAFFORD. I read the hearings carefully this morning, and I assume that there is no purpose on the part of the committee to extend the scope of the commission.

Mr. BYRNS. There is not.

Mr. STAFFORD. As has been recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee under a certain bill now on the calendar.

Mr. BYRNS. It is not the purpose to extend the scope of the commission, and it has not been extended.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not have time to read closely the hearings relating to the need for continuing the service. A former Member of the House, Mr. Robert W. Bonyne, is one of the paid employees of the commission. I know the gentleman from Tennessee realizes how difficult it is to conclude any Government work when once it is begun. When will this work be completed?

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Bonyne and his assistants have rendered splendid service. This Mixed Claims Commission has performed fine service. I understand there are about 16 more claims, involving about \$2,000,000.

It is expected they will be concluded by July 1.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then there is hope that the work will be concluded in the near future, and we will not have a repetition of these other claims commissions like that in Cuba and Mexico, dragging on year after year at great expense to the Government?

Mr. BYRNS. As far as anyone can tell now, this completes the job.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Refunding taxes illegally or erroneously collected: For refunding taxes illegally or erroneously collected, as provided by law, including the payment of claims for the fiscal year 1933 and prior years, \$28,000,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress by internal-revenue districts and alphabetically arranged of all disbursements hereunder in excess of \$500 as required by section 3 of the act of May 29, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 26, sec. 149), including the names of all persons and corporations to whom such payments are made, together with the amount paid to each.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order in order to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations about the rate of interest that is paid by the Government. I understand there is a disparity in the rate of interest that the Government pays and the rate of interest the Government receives from the taxpayers on these refunds.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. I have always felt the Government has rendered a grave injustice, in the sense that it only pays 4 per cent and it charges 6 per cent to those who owe money to the Government because of this overassessment.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I think that is a grave injustice. How can that be remedied?

Mr. BYRNS. It will be necessary to amend the law.

Mr. ALLGOOD. And that can not be done on this appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS. No. It can not.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I just wanted to call that fact to the attention of the House, that an injustice is existing between

the rate of interest paid by the Government and that which is paid by those who owe the Government.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield that I may ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question?

Mr. ALLGOOD. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. At what rate are these refunds being made this year as compared with the previous year?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not have the figures for last year just at this moment. They were made at the rate of \$18,000,000 for the first four months of this fiscal year. Then \$5,600,000 was expended in November of the present fiscal year. It is expected by the committee that the amount appropriated here will be amply sufficient to meet the requirements between now and July 1, everything considered. Eighty million dollars was expended in the year 1931.

Mr. BRIGGS. And the previous year what was the amount of the refund?

Mr. BYRNS. Sixty-nine million dollars for 1930. One hundred and ninety million in 1929.

Mr. BRIGGS. The refunds have been decreasing, possibly, except last year. Is that true?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. If this appropriation proves sufficient—and we believe it will be more than sufficient—it will mean that \$59,000,000 will be repaid this year.

Mr. BRIGGS. What check is being made by Congress, through the joint committee, of these huge refunds? I notice from the newspapers that some of them run into millions of dollars, and it is exceedingly strange that errors of that kind should be made by great organizations and great estates that have an opportunity of getting the very best financial advice in making out their income-tax returns. Why is it that these vast claims are still being pressed upon the Government, with the tremendous refunds following? Has the gentleman any idea why that exists?

Mr. BYRNS. I can not say, except that it is founded upon some mistake that has been found by the examiners or by those who examine the reports. A great many of them are due to court decisions. The Board of Tax Appeals will decide a case one way and the court will decide another. So a great many of these refunds arise out of court decisions.

Mr. BRIGGS. Are the refunds checked by this Joint Committee on Taxation?

Mr. BYRNS. I understand under the law all refunds amounting to \$100,000 and more are required to be sent here for examination by the joint committee to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. BRIGGS. And that committee recommends to Congress payment if it is approved by the joint committee, and only then?

Mr. BYRNS. This joint committee is given 30 days within which to investigate those claims, and if they are not disapproved within that time they are paid.

Mr. ALLGOOD. As I understand, these are virtually judgments against the Government. Regardless of whether we favor or oppose the refunds, they are claims against the Government and bear 4 per cent interest and must be paid.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLGOOD. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it true that all these refund claims are based on judgments, or are they allowances by the Income Tax Bureau, as well as decrees by the Board of Tax Appeals and the courts?

Mr. BYRNS. No. I did not mean to be so understood. I said a great many of them—and I think the majority of them—are based upon court decisions, but many of them are allowed by the commissioner; to what extent, I can not tell the gentleman now.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There has been a great deal of criticism of the Treasury Department as to the refunds made. Before any refund can arise there must be first an application made to the local collector. Then the field man must pass upon it. It then goes to the Income Tax Unit. The Income Tax Unit must approve it. Then it goes to the general counsel and the general counsel must approve of it. If it is more than \$75,000, it comes to the congressional committee for approval. They O. K. it, and then finally it is passed upon by the Comptroller General. Every safeguard is taken on these refunds and there is very little to this criticism that is so general, that there is no merit to the refunds, because they are meritorious claims. Otherwise they would not pass muster of all these supervising officials.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations mentioned the fact that a great many of these refunds are necessitated by judicial interpretations. Is it not a fact that because of those interpretations the Treasury Department, taking advantage of the new determination of the law, collected millions of dollars more than they have refunded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and the practice of the Treasury Department has been for several years to take advantage of, and resolve the benefit of every doubt in favor of the Government, and force the taxpayer to appeal for a refund rather than to have the Government make a claim for deficient taxes against the taxpayer. That is why these funds run into the millions and millions of dollars—because the Government by its policy takes advantage of every doubt in its favor and forces the taxpayer to come to the Government for relief.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Acquisition of land, Fort Knox, Ky.: For the completion of the acquisition of approximately 75 acres of land at Saunders Spring, Ky., for the construction of a water-supply system for Fort Knox, Ky., authorized by the act approved July 3, 1926 (44 Stat., p. 877), fiscal year 1933, \$250.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: Beginning with line 9, page 11, strike out the paragraph ending in line 14.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I feel no special concern in the small amount of money involved in this item.

I made a prediction on the floor of this House a few days ago that has come true even sooner than I expected or anticipated. Down in my country on the Mexican border is a military post, known as Fort D. A. Russell, which only three years ago was made a permanent post of the United States Army by official order of the War Department. Approximately \$1,000,000 is invested in that post. One hundred and eighty houses were built, of which 156 are permanent structures. Four hundred and thirty-five acres of land were bought. That little desert town way down in the southwestern part of Texas, near the Mexican border, was selected when the War Department thought after the Villa raid at Columbus, N. Mex., and the Brite ranch raid that the Big Bend country of Texas was entitled to some protection.

That county, with small tax values and with little land in cultivation or under irrigation, built 151 miles of paved roads. They paved their streets. They built water mains up to the post. They relied upon the faith of the Government.

Right to-day, while I speak, a whole fleet of trucks is moving every soldier from that post, nearly 2,000 miles, to Fort Knox, Ky., and at a very large and unnecessary expense.

Last year the waterworks system at Fort D. A. Russell was improved. Now, the War Department, without even consulting Congress, without consulting any committee, although I had a resolution pending in the House and the

junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] had one pending in the Senate and the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee [Mr. McSWAIN] very courteously asked the Secretary of War to hold up the removal of the troops until there could be a hearing on the matter, arbitrarily moved every soldier, unless it be a few caretakers, out of that post and are now moving them to Fort Knox, Ky.; and I venture to predict again, as I did the other day, that within less than a year instead of \$250 they will be asking for \$250,000 for Fort Knox.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of justice to communities and as a matter of economy, I feel that some policy ought to be determined by Congress about the location and permanence of Army posts. Of course, the President and War Department have the right, as they ought to have, to move troops wherever they think wise; but I say that in peace times the War Department ought not to go into a little town—or a big one either for that matter—and spend a lot of the taxpayers' money and then, without the approval of Congress, arbitrarily abandon a post; spend a lot of money and wreck the business life of a community. Such a course is neither wise nor just.

I recall, as many of you do, that some years ago a new railroad would buy a townsite and build fine railroad shops. It would do a lot of advertising, and people would come in there and buy lots and build houses. Then, in 6, 8, or 10 years, they would move their shops and boost another town. Laws have been passed by the States against such a course, and Congress ought to adopt some kind of a fair and just policy about its Army posts.

Fort Knox will now receive its thousands of dollars. Fort D. A. Russell is abandoned and forgotten, at least by the War Department. The taxpayers pay the bill; and the Army marches on.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. I think I could make the contention and back it up with very sound argument that if in peace time soldiers are needed it is along the Mexican border. I know how Americans suffered after the Columbus raid. I know what happened at the Brite ranch when American citizens were killed, and I say I think I could defend the proposition that soldiers are needed in peace times along the Mexican border in view of the revolutionary activity south of the border.

Furthermore, I have a verbatim copy of the order issued by the War Department that made Fort D. A. Russell a permanent post. I had a resolution in the House and there was one in the Senate, and a request was made of the Secretary of War that this be delayed until at least after the cold winter season, that time should be given to investigate it and determine on a policy, yet the request was disregarded.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What does the gentleman's resolution provide?

Mr. THOMASON. The resolution provides for a fair and just investigation to the end that their order be held up until Congress can determine what is the right and just thing to do. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand the interest of the gentleman from Texas in this particular case; but I fear that the very remedy he suggests explains the reason for the scattering of military posts throughout the United States and the enormous cost of maintenance of the Army. The trouble is that these many small posts were established by Congress, and in the eagerness to obtain such legislative pork a post was put here, there, and everywhere; and then when we are confronted with the necessity of economizing the War Department must necessarily concentrate their

forces in order to cut down expenses. This results in closing many posts.

I submit that the purpose of the Army is not to create business for any locality. It is not to stimulate or to keep a community going. The purpose in peace time is to keep a skeleton army as efficient as possible and trained under the limitations of appropriations which Congress makes.

If the War Department would be left unhampered by Congress and by such complaints as the gentleman from Texas now makes, it might concentrate large bodies of our military forces at five or six various points in the United States. It would be far better for the necessary training of the officers and noncommissioned officers, because, after all, in times of emergency, under modern warfare, they are dealing with large bodies of men. The time has passed when any officer will be called upon in an emergency to handle a small contingent of men such as we had in Indian warfare in the old days.

I was raised on a military post, and I never saw, in all my boyhood, more than one regiment at one time, and no officer can be properly trained by handling a company or a battalion or a regiment. Under modern-warfare conditions it is necessary to train officers in handling and operating with large bodies of men.

I sympathize with the conditions the gentleman describes, but I submit it is not the fault of the War Department. Everyone knows that I have criticized the War Department a great deal, and many times when perhaps I did not know what I was talking about; but this time let me say the War Department is not to blame. The original fault is with Congress in establishing many military posts as log-rolling propositions and then complaining when these posts, as a matter of economic necessity, must be abandoned.

Mr. THOMASON. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. THOMASON. This particular post was established voluntarily by the War Department without the solicitation of this town or section following the Villa raid at Columbus, N. Mex.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That may be true, but the mere fact it was established after an unexpected contingency would, in and of itself, show it was not a permanent establishment.

Mr. THOMASON. Does not the gentleman think that in peace time soldiers are as much needed along the Mexican border, if not more so, than anywhere else in the country?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No. I may say that what I believe is the greatest inspiration for peace in the whole world is the fact that the Canadian border was never fortified and was never manned by any military force on either side of the border. Remember the Army is not and must not be used as a local police force.

Mr. THOMASON. For what purpose does the gentleman think soldiers are needed in Kentucky and what is the need for the building up of a post there at large expense?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If they are going to be trained, they are needed where the largest number can be better trained at the least cost.

Mr. THOMASON. In other words, the gentleman's idea is more and bigger parades?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No; not at all, but more and better training. Certainly it is no justification for the maintenance of a post to say that business needs a military organization at any given place, because if that is true in the gentleman's community, it is true of every community in the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt the wisdom of abandoning at this time any of our military posts. I believe in our zeal for economy—and frankly I am for economy—we should not lessen our national defense.

I support the platform of the Democratic Party that calls for reduction in Government expenses of 25 per cent. I believe we can reduce the expenditures of our Government 25 per cent, or even 50 per cent, without impairing its use-

fulness to our citizens. However, I do not believe we should retrench in our Military Establishment.

I am wondering, when we learn so much about the great army of unemployed and when we are trying to devise measures to relieve unemployment, if it would not be wise if we would open the door of our Army and our Navy to the enlistment of many more American citizens who desire to enlist and who are physically fit and otherwise qualified for military or naval service.

PROVIDE FOR ENLISTMENTS OF 12 MONTHS' DURATION

I realize that the amount paid to a private in the Army or the Navy is very small, but we have hundreds of thousands of young men, as well as older men, in our country who are desirous of enlisting in the Army or Navy and would make good soldiers. Would it not be wise to let them enlist for perhaps 12 months?

We would not necessarily have to establish additional facilities to take care of them. They could be quartered in tents, if you please, in the milder climates of our country.

In my State, Florida, the climate is so mild that they can live the year round in tents. It would be entirely unnecessary to build permanent houses and quarters for them. Hundreds of thousands of them could be so quartered in Florida without any detriment to Florida, and in fact may prove an asset. Here in this wonderful climate and in its open air and sunshine their minds and physical health would be benefited. Their best health would be realized and their minds would find rest and contentment. They would be thus far removed from the turmoil and discontent of our congested population centers, and would, for the time being at least, cease to worry about the bare necessities of life. In this way our Army and Navy would receive most valuable recruits and in all probability the standards and standing of our Army and Navy would be noticeably raised.

The small pay allowed a soldier would go far toward providing the necessities of life for his dependents left at home. Of course, this enlistment should be optional, as it is now. It should not be compulsory. Daily I receive communications from young men and even men of middle age or older begging for the opportunity to join the Army or Navy. The recruiting offices have long lists of eligibles on their waiting lists.

The adequate defense of our country must be provided for. If the door for enlistment was opened, our national defense would be greatly strengthened and at the same time unemployment would be somewhat relieved. The safest nation is the one best prepared to defend itself. In this a twofold purpose could be served.

In this connection our National Guard could be given more drill nights per month and their enlistments could be enlarged. This could be done without much additional cost for equipment. Nearly all of the money paid out would go to the enlisted men and would then be placed by them in circulation in all parts of the country.

I hope my colleagues will consider this matter and will discourage the abandoning of military posts, as in the Texas case.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'CONNOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13975) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with one amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were 25 ayes and 63 noes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 114, nays 170, not voting 146, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—114

Adkins	Crowther	Kemp	Schuetz
Andrew, Mass.	Davis, Pa.	Kvale	Seeger
Auf der Heide	Delaney	LaGuardia	Selvig
Bacon	De Priest	Lankford, Va.	Shott
Beam	Dickstein	Leavitt	Sinclair
Biddle	Dowell	Leibach	Sirovich
Black	Eaton, N. J.	Lichtenwalner	Smith, Idaho
Bolleau	Englebright	Loneragan	Snell
Boland	Finley	Loofbourow	Snow
Bolton	Free	Luce	Somers, N. Y.
Briggs	Gibson	McCormack	Stalker
Brumm	Gifford	Manlove	Stewart
Burdick	Goss	Martin, Mass.	Stull
Burness	Granfield	Millard	Sutphin
Cable	Griffin	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Carter, Calif.	Hadley	Mouser	Temple
Celler	Hall, N. Dak.	Nelson, Me.	Thomason
Chavez	Hancock, N. Y.	Nolan	Turpin
Chindblom	Hartley	Norton, N. J.	Watson
Christgau	Hawley	Peavey	Welch
Clancy	Hess	Person	White
Cochran, Pa.	Hill, Wash.	Pittenger	Wigglesworth
Colton	Holmes	Ramseyer	Withrow
Condon	Hooper	Ransley	Wolcott
Connery	Houston, Del.	Reed, N. Y.	Wolfenden
Connolly	Jenkins	Reid, Ill.	Wolverton
Cooper, Ohio	Johnson, S. Dak.	Robinson	Woodruff
Coyle	Kading	Rogers, Mass.	
Crosser	Kelly, Pa.	Schafer	

NAYS—168

Allgood	Estep	Lamneck	Pratt, Harcourt J.
Almon	Fernandez	Lanham	Pratt, Ruth
Arentz	Fiesinger	Lankford, Ga.	Ragon
Arnold	Fishburne	Larrabee	Rainey
Ayres	Flannagan	Lewis	Ramspeck
Bankhead	Flood	Lovette	Rayburn
Barton	French	Lozier	Reilly
Blanton	Fuller	Ludlow	Rogers, N. H.
Boehne	Fulmer	McClintic, Okla.	Sanders, Tex.
Brand, Ohio	Garber	McClintock, Ohio	Sandlin
Britten	Gasque	McDuffie	Shallenberger
Browning	Gilchrist	McGugin	Shannon
Buchanan	Glover	McKeown	Smith, Va.
Burch	Goldsborough	McMillan	Smith, W. Va.
Busby	Green	McReynolds	Spence
Byrns	Greenwood	McSwain	Stafford
Campbell, Iowa	Gregory	Magrady	Stevenson
Cannon	Haines	Major	Stokes
Carden	Hall, Ill.	Maloney	Strong, Kans.
Castellow	Harlan	Mansfield	Strong, Pa.
Chapman	Hart	Mapes	Summers, Wash.
Christopherson	Hastings	Martin, Oreg.	Swank
Clarke, N. Y.	Haugen	May	Swanson
Cochran, Mo.	Hill, Ala.	Michener	Swick
Cole, Iowa	Hoch	Miller	Taber
Collins	Holaday	Milligan	Tarver
Cox	Hollister	Mitchell	Underwood
Cross	Hope	Montague	Vinson, Ga.
Crowe	Howard	Montet	Vinson, Ky.
Darrow	Huddleston	Moore, Ky.	Warren
Davis, Tenn.	Hull, Morton D.	Morehead	Wason
DeRouen	Jacobsen	Nelson, Mo.	West
Disney	Johnson, Mo.	Norton, Nebr.	Whittington
Dominick	Johnson, Okla.	O'Connor	Williamson
Doughton	Johnson, Tex.	Overton	Wilson
Douglas, Ariz.	Jones	Parker, Ga.	Wingo
Drane	Keller	Parker, N. Y.	Wood, Ga.
Drewry	Kerr	Parks	Wood, Ind.
Driver	Kinzer	Parsons	Woodrum
Dyer	Kniffin	Patman	Wright
Ellzey	Kopp	Patterson	Wyant
Eslick	Lambertson	Pettengill	Yon

NOT VOTING—146

Abernethy	Beck	Bulwinkle	Chipherfield
Aldrich	Beedy	Butler	Clague
Allen	Bland	Campbell, Pa.	Clark, N. C.
Amle	Bloom	Canfield	Cole, Md.
Andresen	Bohn	Carley	Collier
Andrews, N. Y.	Bowman	Carter, Wyo.	Cooke
Bacharach	Boylan	Cartwright	Cooper, Tenn.
Bachmann	Brand, Ga.	Cary	Corning
Baldridge	Brunner	Cavichia	Crall
Barbour	Buckbee	Chase	Crump

Culkin	Guyer	Larsen	Schneider
Cullen	Hall, Miss.	Lea	Seiberling
Curry	Hancock, N. C.	Lindsay	Shreve
Davenport	Hardy	McFadden	Simmons
Dickinson	Hare	McLeod	Sparks
Dies	Hogg, Ind.	Maas	Stegall
Dieterich	Hogg, W. Va.	Mead	Sullivan, N. Y.
Douglass, Mass.	Hopkins	Mobley	Sullivan, Pa.
Doutrich	Hornor	Murphy	Sumners, Tex.
Doxey	Horr	Nelson, Wis.	Sweeney
Eaton, Colo.	Hull, William E.	Niedringhaus	Swing
Erk	Igoe	Oliver, Ala.	Taylor, Colo.
Evans, Calif.	James	Oliver, N. Y.	Thatcher
Evans, Mont.	Jeffers	Owen	Thurston
Fish	Johnson, Ill.	Palmisano	Tierney
Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Wash.	Partridge	Timberlake
Foss	Kahn	Perkins	Tinkham
Frear	Kelly, Ill.	Polk	Treadway
Freeman	Kendall	Pou	Underhill
Fulbright	Kennedy, Md.	Prall	Weaver
Gambrill	Kennedy, N. Y.	Purnell	Weeks
Gavagan	Ketcham	Rankin	Whitley
Gilbert	Kleberg	Rich	Williams, Mo.
Gillen	Knutson	Romjue	Williams, Tex.
Golder	Kunz	Rudd	Yates
Goodwin	Kurtz	Sabath	
Griswold	Lambeth	Sanders, N. Y.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Bacharach.
 Mr. Oliver of Alabama with Mr. Aldrich.
 Mr. Evans of Montana with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Collier with Mr. Evans of California.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Frear.
 Mr. Lindsay with Mr. Beck.
 Mr. Boylan with Mr. Bohn.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Guyer.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Bachmann.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Allen.
 Mr. Pou with Mr. Culkin.
 Mr. Tierney with Mr. Knutson.
 Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Shreve.
 Mr. Gillen with Mr. Rich.
 Mr. Carley with Mr. McLeod.
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Kurtz.
 Mr. Corning with Mr. Cook.
 Mr. Larsen with Mr. Thurston.
 Mr. Mead with Mr. Treadway.
 Mrs. Owen with Mr. Perkins.
 Mr. Dies with Mrs. Kahn.
 Mr. Oliver of New York with Mr. Carter of Wyoming.
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Andrews of New York.
 Mr. Mobley with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Prall with Mr. Beedy.
 Mr. Crump with Mr. Cavichia.
 Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. McFadden.
 Mr. Rudd with Mr. Weeks.
 Mr. Lambeth with Mr. Sparks.
 Mr. Polk with Mr. Niedringhaus.
 Mr. Hare with Mr. Mass.
 Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Buckbee.
 Mr. Rankin with Mr. Campbell of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Davenport.
 Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Erk.
 Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Freeman.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Golder.
 Mr. Brunner with Mr. Hogg of Indiana.
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Chase.
 Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Hopkins.
 Mr. Lea with Mr. Clague.
 Mr. Williams of Missouri with Mr. Kendall.
 Mr. Doxey with Mr. Chipfield.
 Mr. Cary with Mr. Purnell.
 Mr. Williams of Texas with Mr. Murphy.
 Mr. Sullivan of New York with Mr. Bowman.
 Mr. Igoe with Mr. Eaton of Colorado.
 Mr. Bloom with Mr. Foss.
 Mr. Hall of Mississippi with Mr. Thatcher.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Underhill.
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Whitley.
 Mr. Bland with Mr. Ketcham.
 Mr. Hornor with Mr. Barber.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Amle.
 Mr. Jeffers with Mr. Horr.
 Mr. Brand of Georgia with Mr. James.
 Mr. Canfield with Mr. Johnson of Washington.
 Mr. Palmisano with Mr. Hardy.
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Simmons.
 Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Tinkham.
 Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Yates.
 Mr. Dieterich with Mr. William E. Hull.
 Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Goodwin.
 Mr. Cooper of Tennessee with Mr. Curry.
 Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts with Mr. Crall.
 Mr. Kuntz with Mr. Seiberling.
 Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Timberlake.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] is absent on account of serious illness in his family. If he were present, he would have voted "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED COTTON TO RED CROSS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13607) to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the Red Cross, and other organizations, for relief of distress, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the bill going to conference provided the conferees will give the House an opportunity to vote on the last amendment proposed by the Senate, if they should happen to agree to it. I do not wish to tie the hands of the conferees, but the last amendment is an entire departure from anything carried in the original House bill. It authorizes the Government to credit the Cotton Stabilization Board for money advanced for various purposes. I think the gentleman will agree that that is a departure from the purpose of the original bill.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman refers to the Senate amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. If, for instance, the conferees agree to cut out the Senate amendment, then it would be perfectly satisfactory to the gentleman?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. JONES, Mr. FULMER, Mr. HAUGEN.

STREET RAILWAY MERGER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 154, to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand it, there is no great difference of opinion between the House bill and the Senate bill?

Mrs. NORTON. Oh, there are quite a number of Senate amendments. I have taken the matter up with my committee, and the committee has agreed to all of the Senate amendments.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that the objections that we raised to the bill in the House were looked after in the Senate and that all of the matters were properly safeguarded in the interest of the people of the District?

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman that they have all been safeguarded.

Mr. BLANTON. Therefore, I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will see fit to let the gentlewoman's request be granted.

Mr. SCHAFER. That may be true; but if the beer bill comes back with Senate amendments, is the gentleman going to agree to all of the amendments without inquiry?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not. No beer bill is coming back from the Senate. I predict that the Senate is not going to violate the Constitution of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KLEBERG, at the request of Mr. THOMASON, on account of illness.

To Mr. DIES, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. MEAD, for one week, on account of illness.

To Mr. BOHN, indefinitely, at the request of Mr. HOOPER, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 5, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, January 5, 1933, as reported to the floor leader:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UTILITIES
(8 p. m.)

H. R. 13853, a bill to authorize the merger of the Georgetown Gaslight Co. with Washington Gas Light Co.

RIVERS AND HARBORS
(10.30 a. m.)

Hearings on Calumet Harbor and River project.

MERCHANT MARINE, RADIO, AND FISHERIES
(10 a. m.)

Hearings on S. 4491, a bill for regulation of intercoastal carriers.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

845. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the Chief of Engineers, pursuant to the rivers and harbors act approved July 3, 1930, on preliminary examination and survey of Erie Harbor, Pa., together with accompanying papers and illustrations; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

846. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request that the estimate of appropriation of \$396,048,200 for military and naval compensation, Veterans' Administration, as contained in the Budget for the fiscal year 1934, be reduced to \$372,800,000 (H. Doc. No. 518); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

847. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, Library of Congress, for the fiscal year 1934, in the sum of \$3,600 (H. Doc. No. 519); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. POU: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 339. A resolution for the consideration of H. R. 13991, a bill to aid agriculture and relieve existing national economic emergency; without amendment (Rept. No. 1817). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GAMBRILL: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6872. A bill for the relief of Elbert L. Grove; with amendment (Rept. No. 1818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COYLE: A bill (H. R. 14030) authorizing the Bushkill Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River at or near Bushkill, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 14031) to provide for the refinancing of farm-mortgage indebtedness by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 14032) to liquidate and refinance agricultural indebtedness and to encourage and promote agriculture, industry, and commerce by establishing a credit system through which farm mortgages may be liquidated and refinanced or refunded at a reduced rate of interest through the Federal reserve banking system and the Federal farm-loan system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14033) to amend the tariff act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14034) to regulate advertising of imported articles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 14035) to provide that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make loans to farmers on the security of first mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Resolution (H. Res. 340) for the consideration of H. R. 11816, a bill to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COYLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 537) to repeal the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PESQUERA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 538) for the relief of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTER of California: A bill (H. R. 14036) for the relief of Charles Burger, warrant officer (retired); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14037) for the relief of Ernest B. Butte; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14038) for the relief of Wallace M. Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 14039) granting an increase of pension to Lena Krieger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTGAU: A bill (H. R. 14040) for the relief of Edgar Stivers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 14041) for the relief of the Imperial Shipbuilding Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14042) for the relief of Maurice E. Schaffer; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14043) for the relief of B. Edward Westwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 14044) for the relief of Otha S. Curd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 14045) for the relief of Robert M. Pennock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14046) for the relief of Joseph A. Urrey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 14047) granting an increase of pension to Laura B. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KUNZ: A bill (H. R. 14048) for the relief of Paul Kiehler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14049) to correct the naval record of Walter C. Schalk; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 14050) for the relief of Virgil Buzard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 14051) granting a pension to Joseph Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 14052) for the relief of Emma F. Taber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 14053) granting a pension to Winnie Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDLIN: A bill (H. R. 14054) for the relief of Edward W. Goetz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 14055) for the relief of Orrin Burr; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14056) granting an increase of pension to Martha Buckingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 14057) granting an increase of pension to Deborah Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YATES: A bill (H. R. 14058) granting a pension to Elizabeth Dannerberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9359. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, N. Y., favoring constitutional amendment eliminating the count of aliens for apportionment purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9360. By Mr. CARTER of California: Petition of Rev. Charles B. Johnson and 40 other residents of Contra Costa County, Calif., urging the passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9361. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Rogers Park Methodist Episcopal Church, Chicago, Ill., Lily I. Cotter, president, and Eloise S. Waite, secretary, urging the enactment of Senate bill 3770 and Senate Resolution 170, relating to the motion-picture industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9362. Also, petition of Jennie W. Ferry, 604 North Jackson Street, Waukegan, and 48 other citizens of Waukegan, North Chicago, Lake Forest, and Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of the stop-alien representation amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9363. By Mr. CHRISTGAU: Resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the Alden Parent Teacher Association, Alden, Minn., urging support of Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9364. Also, resolution adopted at the regular executive meeting of the Burwell Parent Teacher Association of Hopkins, Minn., urging support of Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9365. Also, resolution adopted at a meeting of the Cathedral Parent Teacher Association of Winona, Minn., urging support of Senate bill 1079; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9366. Also, resolution adopted at a meeting of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Chatfield, Minn., urging support of Senate bill 1079; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9367. Also, resolution adopted at a meeting of the St. Joseph's Catholic School, of Winona, Minn., Parent-Teacher Association of the city of Winona, Minn., urging support

of Senate bill 1079; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9368. Also, resolution adopted by the Anderson-Miller Post, No. 163, American Legion, Willow River, Minn., urging that favorable action be taken on the measures providing for the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9369. By Mr. HARLAN: Petition of Irene Denlinger and other residents of Trotwood, Ohio, urging support for the stop-alien representation amendment, and count only American citizens, when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9370. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Dodds Granite Corporation, Milford, Mass., favoring the use of granite for the New York Federal courthouse; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9371. Also, petition of Sadie E. Leinfelder, of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing further cut in Federal salaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9372. By Mr. MAGRADY: Petition of Eva L. Van Dine, Judith Myers, Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Stamm and sons, Mr. Waldron, Wilda B. Margritz, Mrs. S. J. Pannebaker, Mrs. V. Young, and Elizabeth Stump, all of Potts Grove, Northumberland County, Pa., favoring the stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9373. By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of 17 residents of Salineville, Ohio, urging the passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the 6,280,000 aliens in this country and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9374. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Long Island Chamber of Commerce, Long Island, N. Y., opposing the ratification of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway treaty; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9375. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of Rev. W. Frank Lister and 71 others, favoring the adoption of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9376. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Fraternal Order of Eagles of Washington and Greene Counties, Pa., protesting against the continuance of the furlough provision in the economy law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 1933

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

HUBERT D. STEPHENS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13607) to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONES, Mr. FULMER, and Mr. HAUGEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13975) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Public Printer, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the work of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1932, and also for the last half of the calendar year 1932, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

COUNT OF THE ELECTORAL VOTE

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 44, agreed to by the Senate on yesterday, the Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] as the tellers on the part of the Senate in the counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President at the joint session of the two Houses of Congress on Wednesday, February 8, next.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the American Historical Association in convention assembled favoring the making of an appropriation for continuation of the publication by the Government of the official papers of the Territories from which States have been formed as an important contribution to the understanding of American history, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the New York Detachment, No. 1; Hudson Detachment, Jersey City, N. J.; Captain Burwell H. Clarke Detachment, of Newark, N. J.; and the Bergen County Detachment, of Hackensack, N. J., Marine Corps League, in joint conference assembled, opposing further reduction in the personnel of the United States Marine Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Association of New York State Canners (Inc.) opposing governmental participation in the activities of the canning industry, and favoring the exclusion of food products from the operation of a general sales tax, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Warehousemen's Association of the Port of New York (Inc.), New York City, protesting against favorable consideration by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of a proposal for a loan of \$11,000,000, or any other sum, for financing development of the water front in New York Harbor for increased terminal facilities, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Neversink Division, No. 52, Order of Railroad Conductors, of Port Jervis, N. Y., protesting against proposed further wage reductions affecting railway employees, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of the president of Miss Mason's School, The Castle, Tarrytown-on-Hudson, N. Y., and sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the passage of the bill (S. 4472) to provide for the restoration, through exchange, of certain timberlands to the Yosemite National Park, Calif., and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Academy Civic Association, Public School No. 165, 225 West One hundred and eighth Street, New York City, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the economy act in the interest of Federal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens, being letter carriers attached to the Corona, N. Y., post office, remonstrating against the passage of legislation to further reduce the compensation of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Woman's Matowac Democratic Organization, of Bayside, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the economy act in the interest